E Typographiâ prodeat opus iſtud cui Titulus, A Rational Account of the Grounds of Proteſtant Religion, being a Vindication of the Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*'s Relation of a Conference, *&c.* from the Pretended Anſwer by *T. C.*

Humfr. London.

2 *Novemb.* 1664.

E Typographiâ prodeat opus iſtud cui Titulus, A Rational Account of the Grounds of Proteſtant Religion, being a Vindication of the Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*'s Relation of a Conference, *&c.* from the Pretended Anſwer by *T. C.*

Humfr. London.

2 *Novemb.* 1664.

A Rational Account OF THE GROUNDS OF Protestant Religion: BEING A VINDICATION OF THE Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY'S RELATION Of a CONFERENCE, &c. From the pretended ANSWER by T. C.

Wherein the true GROUNDS of FAITH are cleared, and the False discovered; the CHURCH of ENGLAND Vindicated from the imputation of Schism; and the most important particular Controversies between Us and Those of the Church of ROME throughly Examined.

By EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, D. D. Dean of S. *Paul's*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his MAJESTY.

The Second Edition.

LONDON,
Printed for *H. Mortlock* at the Sign of the *Phœnix* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard, and the *White-Hart* in *Westminster*-Hall. MDCLXXXI.

BODLEIAN
20.3
LIBRARY

TO HIS MOST Sacred Majeſty CHARLES II.

By the Grace of God King of Great BRITAIN, FRANCE, and IRELAND, Defender of the Faith, &c.

Moſt Gracious Soveraign,

SInce that great Miracle of *Divine Providence* in your *Majeſties* moſt happy *reſtauration*, we have ſeen thoſe who before Triumphed over the *Church* of *England* as *dead*, as much expreſſing their envy at her *reſurrection.* Neither could it otherwiſe be expected, but that ſo ſudden a recovery of her former *luſtre*, would open the mouths of her weak but contentious *Adverſaries*, who ſee her ſhine in a *Firmament* ſo much above them. But it is a part of her preſent *Felicity*, that they are aſhamed

of that inſulting Queſtion, *What is become of your Church now?* and are driven back to their old impertinency, *Where was your Church before* Luther? They might as well alter the date of it, and ask Where ſhe was before your *Majeſties* reſtauration? For as ſhe only ſuffered an *Eclipſe* in the late confuſions; no more did ſhe, though of a longer ſtay, in the times before the *Reformation.* And it was her great *Honour*, that ſhe was not awakened out of it (as of old they fancied) by the *beating of drums*, or the rude *clamours* of the *people*; but as ſhe Gradually regained her *light*, ſo it was with the *Influence* of *Supream Authority.* Which hath cauſed ſo cloſe an union and combination of *Intereſts* between them, that the *Church* of *England*, and the *Royal Family*, have like *Hippocrates* his *Twins* both *wept* and *rejoyc'd* together. And nothing doth more argue the excellent conſtitution of our *Church*, than that therein the purity of *Chriſtian Doctrine* is joyned with the moſt hearty Acknowledgement of your *Majeſties Power* and *Supremacy.* So that the *Loyalty* of the members of it can neither be ſuſpected of private Intereſt, or of depending on the pleaſure of a Forreign *Biſhop*, but is inlaid in the very *Foundations* of our *Reformation.* Which ſtands on thoſe two *Grand Principles* of *Religion* and *Government*; The *giving to God the things that are God's, and to* Cæſar *the things that are* Cæſar's. And as long as theſe two remain unſhaken, we need not fear the continuance and flouriſhing of the *Reformed Church* of *England*, and your *Majeſties Intereſt* in the members of it. Which it is hard to conceive thoſe can have any zeal for, who are the

buſie

buſie *Factours* among us for promoting ſo oppoſite an *Intereſs* as that of the *Church* of *Rome*. For what a contradiction is it, to ſuppoſe it conſiſtent with your *Majeſties Honour* and *Intereſs*, to rob your *Imperial Crown* of one of the richeſt *Jewels* of it, to expoſe Your *Royal Scepter* to the *mercy* of a *Forraign Prelate*, to have another *Supreme Head* acknowledged within Your *Dominions*, and thereby to cut off the dependence of a conſiderable part of the Nation wholly from *Your Self*, and to exhauſt the *Nation* of an Infinite *Maſs* of *Treaſure* meerly to ſupport the *Grandeur* of the *See* of *Rome*? They who can make men believe that theſe things tend to *Your Majeſties* Service, think they have gained thereby a conſiderable ſtep to their *Religion*, which is by baffling mens reaſon, and perſwading them to believe contradictions. But if, notwithſtanding the received principles of their *Church*, any have continued Faithful in their Loyalty to *Your Majeſty*, we have much more cauſe to attribute it to their *Love* to their *King* and *Countrey*, than to their *Religion*. We deny not, but there may be ſuch rare tempers which may conquer the *malignity* of *poiſon*, but it would be a dangerous *Inference* from thence, that it ought not to be accounted hurtful to humane nature. If any ſuch have been truly *Loyal*, may they continue ſo, and their number increaſe: and ſince therein they ſo much come off from themſelves, we hope they may yet come nearer to us, whoſe *Religion* tends as much to the ſettling the only ſure *Foundations* of *Loyalty*, as theirs doth to the weakning of them. And were this the only Controverſie between us, there need not many Books be written to perſwade men of the Truth of it.

But

But if theſe men may be believed, we can as little pleaſe *God* on the principles of our *Church*, as they *Your Majeſty* on the principles of theirs. A ſtrange Aſſertion! and impoſſible to be entertain'd by any but thoſe who think there is no ſuch way to pleaſe *God*, as to renounce the judgement of Senſe and Reaſon. And then indeed we freely confeſs there are none ſo likely to do it, as themſelves. With whom men are equally bound to believe the greateſt *repugnancies* to ſenſe and reaſon, with the moſt *Fundamental Verities* of *Chriſtian Faith*. As though no *Faith* could carry men to Heaven, but that which can, not only *remove*, but *ſwallow Mountains*. Yet theſe are the perſons who pretend to make our Faith *Infallible*, while they undermine the *Foundations* of it, as they advance *Charity* by denying *Salvation* to all but themſelves, and promote true *Piety* by their groſs *Superſtitions*. By all which they have been guilty of *debauching Chriſtianity* in ſo high a meaſure, that it cannot but heartily grieve thoſe who honour it as the moſt excellent *Religion* in the World, to ſee its *beauty* ſo much *clouded* by the *Errours* and *Superſtitions* of the *Roman Church*.

That theſe are *great* as well as *ſad truths*, is the deſign of the enſuing Book to diſcover. Which I humbly preſent to *Your Majeſties* hands, both as it is a *Defence* of that *Cauſe* wherein *Your Majeſties Intereſs* is ſo highly concern'd, and of that *Book* which *Your Royal Father* of moſt *Glorious Memory*, ſo highly honoured, not only by his own peruſal and approbation, but by the commendation of it to his *Deareſt Children*

Children. On which account, I am more encouraged to hope for your *Majeſties* acceptance of this, becauſe it appears under the *Shadow*, as well as for the *Defence*, of ſo great a *Name.* And ſince *God* hath bleſſed *Your Majeſty* with ſo happy and rare a mixture, of *Power*, and *Sweetneſs of Temper*, May they be ſtill imployed in the *Love* and *Defence* of our *Reformed Church*; which is the hearty prayer of

Your Majeſties moſt Loyal

and Obedient Subject,

E. STILLINGFLEET.

THE

PREFACE

TO THE

READER.

IT is now about a twelvemonth, ſince there appeared to the World a Book, under the Title of Dr. *Laud*'s *Labyrinth*; but, with the uſual ſincerity of thoſe perſons, pretended to be Printed ſome years before. It is not the buſineſs of this Preface to enquire, Why if Printed then, it remained ſo long unpubliſhed, but to acquaint the Reader with the ſcope and deſign of that Book, and of this which comes forth as a Reply to it. There are three things mainly in diſpute between us, and thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, *viz.* Whether they, or we, give the more ſatisfactory account of the *Grounds* of *Faith*? Whether their *Church*, or *ours*, be guilty of the charge of *Schiſm*? And, Whether their *Church* be juſtly accuſed by us of introducing many *Errors* and *Superſtitions*? In the handling of theſe, all our preſent Debate conſiſts; and therefore, for the greater Advantage of the Reader, I have diſtributed the whole into three diſtinct parts: which I thought more commodious, than carrying it on in one continued diſcourſe. And, leſt our *Adverſaries* ſhould complain, that we ſtill proceed in a deſtructive way, I have not only endeavoured to lay open the palpable weakneſs of their Cauſe, but to give a rational account of our own Doctrine in oppoſition to theirs. Which I have eſpecially done in the great Controverſie of the *Reſolution*

of *Faith*, as being the moſt difficult and important of any other. I hope the Reader will have no cauſe to blame me for falſe or impertinent Allegations of the *Fathers*, ſince it hath been ſo much my buſineſs to diſcover the fraud of our *Adverſaries* in that particular: which I have chiefly done from the ſcope and deſign of thoſe very Books, out of which their teſtimonies are produced. In many of the particular Differences, I have made uſe of ſeveral of their late Writers againſt themſelves; both to let them ſee, how much *Popery* begins to grow weary of it ſelf; and, how unjuſtly they condemn us for denying thoſe things, which the moderate and rational men of their own ſide diſown, and diſpute againſt as well as we; and chiefly to undeceive the world, as to their great pretence of *Unity* among themſelves. Since their Diviſions are grown to ſo great a height both at home and in foreign parts, that the diſſenting parties mutually charge each other with *Hereſie*, and that about their great *Foundation* of Faith, *viz.* the *Popes Infallibility*; The *Janſeniſts* in *France*, and a growing party in *England*, charging the *Jeſuits* with *Hereſie* in aſſerting it, as they do them with the ſame for denying it. As to my ſelf, I only declare, that I have with freedom and impartiality enquired into the Reaſons on both ſides, and no intereſt hath kept me from letting that ſide of the ballance fall, where I ſaw the greater weight of reaſon. In which reſpect, I have been ſo far from diſſembling the force of any of our *Adverſaries* Arguments, that if I could add greater weight to them, I have done it; being as unwilling to abuſe my ſelf as the world. And therefore I have not only conſulted their greateſt Authors, eſpecially the three famous *Cardinals*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, and *Perron*; but the chiefeſt of thoſe, who, under the name of *Conciliators*, have put the faireſt Varniſh on the Doctrine of that *Church*. However, I have kept cloſe to my *Adverſary*, and followed him through all his windings, from which I return with this ſatisfaction to my ſelf, that I have vindicated his *Lordſhip* and *Truth* together. As to the ſtyle and way of writing I uſe, all that I have to ſay, is, that my deſign hath been to joyn clearneſs of Expreſſion, with evidence of *Reaſon*. What ſucceſs I have had in it, muſt be left to the Readers judgement; I only deſire him to lay aſide *prejudice* as much in judging, as I have done in writing; otherwiſe I deſpair of his doing me right, and of my doing him good. For, though reaſon be tractable and ingenuous, yet prejudice and intereſt are invincible things.

Having done thus much by way of Preface, I ſhall not detain thee longer, by a particular Anſwer to the impertinencies of our *Authors* Preface, ſince there is nothing contained therein, but

wha

what is abundantly anſwered in a more proper place. And I cannot think it reaſonable to abuſe ſo much the Readers *Appetite*, as to give him a tedious *Preface* to cloy his ſtomach. If any, after peruſal of the whole, ſhall think fit to return an Anſwer, if they do it fairly and rationally, they ſhall receive the ſame civility; if with clamor and impertinency, I only let them know, I have not leiſure enough to kill *Flyes*, though they make a troubleſom noiſe. If any ſervice be done to *God*, or the *Church*, by this preſent work, next to that *Divine Aſſiſtance*, through which I have done it, thou oweſt it to thoſe great Pillars of our *Church*, by whoſe command and encouragement I undertook it. Who the Author was of the Book I anſwer, I have been the leſs ſolicitous to enquire, becauſe I would not betray the weakneſs of my cauſe, by mixing perſonal matters in debates of ſo great importance. And, whether he be now living, or dead, I ſuppoſe our *Adverſaries* cannot think it at all material, unleſs they judge that their Cauſe doth live and dye with him.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

PART I.

Of the Grounds of Faith.

CHAP. I.

The Occaſion of the Conference, and defence of the Greek Church.

T. C.'s *Title examined and retorted. The Labyrinth found in his Book and Doctrine. The occaſion of the Conference about the Churches Infallibility. The riſe of the diſpute about the Greek Church, and the conſequences from it. The Charge of Hereſie againſt the Greek Church examined, and ſhe found, Not-guilty, by the concurrent teſtimony of Fathers, General Councils, and Popes. Of the Council of* Florence *and the proceedings there; That Council neither General nor Free. The diſtinction of Ancient and Modern Greeks, diſproved. The debate of the* Filioque *being inſerted into the Creed. The time when and the right by which it was done, diſcuſſed. The riſe of the Schiſm between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches, mainly occaſioned by the Church of* Rome. page 1

CHAP. II.

Of Fundamentals in General.

The Popiſh Tenet concerning Fundamentals, a meer ſtep to the Roman *Greatneſs. The Queſtion about Fundamentals ſtated. An enquiry into the nature of them. What are Fundamentals, in order to particular perſons; and what to be owned as ſuch, in order to Eccleſiaſtical Communion. The prudence and Moderation of the Church of* England, *in defining Articles of Faith. What judged Fundamental by the Catholick Church. No new Articles of Faith can become neceſſary. The Churches power in propounding matters of Faith, examined. What is a ſufficient Propoſition. Of the Athanaſian Creed, and its being owned by the Church of* England. *In what ſenſe the Articles of it are neceſſary to Salvation. Of the diſtinction of the material and formal object of Faith, as to Fundamentals. His Lordſhip's integrity, and* T. C. *his forgery, in the teſtimony of* Scotus. *Of Hereſie, and how far the Church may declare matters of Faith. The teſtimony of S.* Auguſtin *vindicated.* p. 41

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The Absurdities of the *Romanists* Doctrine of Fundamentals.

The Churches Authority must be Divine, if whatever she defines be Fundamental. His Lordship, and not the Testimony of S. Augustine, *shamefully abused, three several ways.* Bellarmin *not mis-cited; the* Pelagian *Heresie condemned by the General Council at* Ephesus. *The Popes Authority not implyed in that of Councils. The gross Absurdities of the distinction of the Church teaching and representative, from the Church taught and diffusive, in the Question of Fundamentals. The Churches Authority and Testimony in matters of Faith, distinguished. The Testimony of* Vincentius Lirinensis *explained, and shewed to be directly contrary to the* Roman *Doctrine of Fundamentals.* Stapleton *and* Bellarmin, *not reconciled by the vain endeavours used to that end.* p. 74

CHAP. IV.

The Protestant Doctrine of Fundamentals, vindicated.

The unreasonableness of demanding a Catalogue of Fundamentals. The Creed contains the Fundamentals of Christian Communion. The belief of Scripture supposed by it. The Dispute concerning the Sense of Christs Descent into Hell, and Mr. Rogers *his Book, confessed by* T. C. *impertinent: With others of the same nature.* T. C. *his fraud, in citing his Lordships words. Of Papists and Protestants Unity. The Moderation of the Church of* England, *compared with that of* Rome. *Her grounds of Faith justified. Infant-Baptism how far proved out of Scripture alone.* p. 91

CHAP. V.

The Romanists way of Resolving Faith.

The ill consequences of the resolution of Faith by the Churches Infallibility. The grand Absurdities of it, manifested by its great unreasonableness in many particulars. The certain Foundations of Faith unsetled by it, as is largely proved. The Circle unavoidable by their new attempts. The impossibility of proving the Church Infallible by the way that Moses, *Christ, and his Apostles were proved to be so. Of the Motives of Credibility, and how far they belong to the Church. The difference between Science and Faith considered, and the new art of mens believing with their wills. The Churches Testimony must be, according to their principles, the formal object of Faith. Of their esteem of Fathers, Scripture, and Councils. The rare distinctions concerning the Churches Infallibility discussed. How the Church can be Infallible by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, yet not divinely Infallible, but in a manner and after a sort.* T. C. *applauded for his excellent faculty in contradicting himself.* p. 102

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Infallibility of Tradition.

Of the unwritten Word, and the neceſſary Ingredients of it. The Inſtances for it particularly examined and diſproved. The Fathers Rule for examining Traditions. No unwritten Word the Foundation of Divine Faith. In what ſenſe Faith may be ſaid to be Divine. Of Tradition being known by its own light, and the Canon of the Scripture. The Teſtimony of the Spirit, how far pertinent to this Controverſie. Of the uſe of Reaſon in the reſolution of Faith. T. C.*'s Dialogue anſwered, with another between himſelf and a Sceptick. A twofold reſolution of Faith into the Doctrine, and into the Books. Several Objections anſwered from the Suppoſition made of a Child brought up without ſight of Scripture. Chriſt no Ignoramus nor Impoſtor, though the Church be not Infallible.* T. C.*'s Blaſphemy in ſaying otherwiſe. The Teſtimonies of* Irenæus *and S.* Auguſtin *examined and retorted. Of the nature of Infallible Certainty, as to the Canon of Scripture; and whereon it is grounded. The Teſtimonies produced by his Lordſhip, vindicated.* p. 150

CHAP. VII.

The Proteſtant Way of reſolving Faith.

Several Principles premiſed in order to it. The diſtinct Queſtions ſet down, and their ſeveral Reſolutions given. The Truth of matters of fact, the Divinity of the Doctrine, and of the Books of Scripture, diſtinctly reſolved into their proper grounds. Moral Certainty a ſufficient Foundation for Faith, and yet Chriſtian Religion proved to be infallibly true. How Apoſtolical Tradition made by his Lordſhip a Foundation of Faith. Of the Certainty we have of the Copies of Scripture, and the Authority of them. S. Auguſtine*'s Teſtimony concerning Church-Authority, largely diſcuſſed and vindicated. Of the private Spirit, and the neceſſity of Grace. His Lordſhip's Way of reſolving Faith vindicated. How far Scripture may be ſaid to be known by its own Light. The ſeveral Teſtimonies of* Bellarmine, Brierly, *and* Hooker, *cleared.* p. 188

CHAP. VIII.

The Churches Infallibility not proved from Scripture.

Some general Conſiderations from the deſign of proving the Churches Infallibility from Scripture. No Infallibility in the High-Prieſt and his Clergy under the Law; if there had been, no neceſſity there ſhould be under the Goſpel. Of S. Baſil*'s Teſtimony concerning Traditions. Scripture leſs liable to corruptions than Traditions. The great uncertainty of judging Traditions, when Apoſtolical, when not. The Churches perpetuity being promiſed in Scripture, proves not its Infallibility. His Lordſhip doth not falſifie* A. C.*'s words, but* T. C. *doth his meaning. Producing the Jeſuits words no traducing their Order.* T. C.*'s miſerable Apology for them. The particular Texts produced for the Churches Infallibility, examined. No ſuch Infallibility neceſſary in the Apoſtles Succeſſours, as in Themſelves. The Similitude of Scripture and Tradition to an Ambaſſadour and his Credentials, rightly ſtated.* p. 218

CHAP. IX.

The Senſe of the Fathers in this Controverſie.

The Judgement of Antiquity enquired into, eſpecially of the three firſt Centuries; and the reaſons for it. The ſeveral Teſtimonies of Juſtin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, *and all the Fathers who writ in vindication of Chriſtian Religion, manifeſted to concur fully with our way of reſolving Faith.* T. C.*'s Anſwers to* Vincentius Lirinenſis, à Gandavo, *and the Fathers produced by his Lordſhip pitifully weak. The particulars of his 9th. Chapter examined.* S. Auguſtin*'s Teſtimony vindicated.* T. C.*'s nauſeous Repetitions ſent as Vagrants to their ſeveral homes. His Lordſhips Conſiderations found too heavy for* T. C.*'s Anſwers. In what ſenſe the Scripture may be called a* Præcognitum. *What way the Jews reſolved their Faith. This Controverſie, and the firſt part, concluded.* p. 243

PART II.

Of Schiſm.

CHAP. I.

Of the Univerſal Church.

THE Queſtion of Schiſm explained. The nature of it enquired into. Several general Principles laid down for clearing the preſent Controverſie. Three grounds of the charge of Schiſm on Proteſtant Churches by our Author. The firſt, of the Roman Churches being the Catholick Church, entred upon. How far the Roman Church may be ſaid to be a true Church. The diſtinction of a Church morally, and metaphyſically true, juſtified. The grounds of the Unity of the Catholick Church, as to Doctrine and Government. Cardinal Perron*'s diſtinction of the formal, cauſal, and participative Catholick Church examined. The true ſenſe of the Catholick Church in Antiquity manifeſted from S.* Cyprian, *and ſeveral caſes happening in his time: as, the Schiſm of* Novatianus *at* Rome; *the caſe of* Feliciſſimus *and* Fortunatus. *Several other Inſtances out of Antiquity to the ſame purpoſe, by all which it is manifeſt, that the Unity of the Catholick Church had no dependence of the Church of* Rome. *The ſeveral Teſtimonies to the contrary of S.* Ambroſe, *S.* Hierom, John *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *S.* Auguſtin, Optatus, *&c. particularly examined; and all found ſhort of proving that the Roman Church is the Catholick Church. The ſeveral Anſwers of his Lordſhip to the Teſtimonies of S.* Cyprian, *S.* Hierom, *S.* Greg. Nazianzen, *S.* Cyril, *and* Ruffinus, *about the Infallibility of the Church of* Rome, *juſtified. From all which it appears, that the making the Roman Church to be the Catholick, is a great Novelty, and perfect Jeſuitiſm.* p. 269

CHAP. II.

Proteſtants no Schiſmaticks.

Schiſm a culpable Separation; therefore the Queſtion of Schiſm muſt be determined by enquiring into the cauſes of it. The plea from the Church of Rome*'s being once a right Church, conſidered. No neceſſity of aſſigning the punctual time when*

when errors crept into her. An account why the originals of errors seem obscure. By Stapletons *Confession, the Roman and Catholick Church were not the same. The falsity of that assertion manifested, that there could be no pure Church since the Apostles times, if the Roman Church were corrupt. No one particular Church free from corruptions; yet no separation from the Catholick Church. How far the Catholick Church may be said to err. Men may have distinct communion from any one particular Church, yet not separate from the Catholick Church. The Testimony of* Petrus de Alliaco *vindicated.* Bellarmin *not miscited.* Almain *full to his Lordships purpose. The Romanists guilty of the present Schism, and not Protestants. In what sense there can be no just cause of Schism; and how far that concerns our case. Protestants did not depart from the Church of* Rome, *but were thrust out of it. The Vindication of the Church of* Rome *from Schism, at last depends upon the two false Principles, of her Infallibility, and being the Catholick Church. The Testimonies of S.* Bernard, *and S.* Austin *not to the purpose. The Catalogue of Fundamentals, the Churches not erring, &c. referr'd back to their proper places.* p. 302

CHAP. III.

Of keeping Faith with Hereticks.

The occasion of this Dispute. The reason why this Doctrine is not commonly defended: Yet all own such Principles from whence it necessarily follows. The matter of fact as to the Council of Constance, *and* John Hus, *opened. Of the nature of the safe-conduct granted him by the Emperor, that it was not a general one,* salvâ justitiâ, *but particular,* jure speciali; *which is largely proved. The particulars concerning* Hierom *of* Prague. *Of the safe-conduct granted by the Council of* Trent. *Of the distinction of Secular and Ecclesiastical Power, and that from thence it follows, that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.* Simancha, *and several others fully assert this Doctrine. Of the Invitation to the Council of* Trent, *and the good Instructions there; and of Publick Disputation.* p. 320

CHAP. IV.

The Reformation of the Church of *England* justified.

The Church of Rome *guilty of Schism, by unjustly casting Protestants out of Communion. The Communion of the Catholick and particular Churches, distinguished. No separation of Protestants from the Catholick Church. The Devotions of the Church of* England *and* Rome *compared. Particular Churches Power to reform themselves in case of general Corruption, proved. The Instance from the Church of* Judah *vindicated. The Church of* Rome *parallel'd with the ten Tribes. General Corruptions make Reformation the more necessary. Whether those things we condemn as errors, were Catholick Tenets at the time of the Reformation. The contrary shewed, and the difference of the Church of* Rome *before and since the Reformation. When things may be said to be received as Catholick Doctrines. How far particular Churches Power to reform themselves extends. His Lordships Instances for the Power of Provincial Councils in matters of Reformation vindicated. The particular case of the Church of* England *discussed. The proceedings in our Reformation defended. The Church of* England *a true Church. The National Synod* 1562. *a lawful Synod. The Bishops no intruders in Queen* Elizabeth's *time. The justice and moderation of the Church of* England *in her Reformation. The Popes Power here, a forcible and fraudulent Usurpation.* p. 332

CHAP. V.

Of the *Roman* Churches Authority.

The Queſtion concerning the Church of Rome*'s Authority entred upon. How far our Church, in reforming her ſelf, condemns the Church of* Rome. *The Pope's equality with other Patriarchs, aſſerted. The Arabick Canons of the Nicene Council proved to be ſuppoſititious. The Polity of the Ancient Church diſcovered from the ſixth Canon of the Council of* Nice. *The Rights of Primats and Metropolitans ſettled by it. The ſuitableneſs of the Eccleſiaſtical, to the Civil Government. That the Biſhop of* Rome *had then a limited Juriſdiction within the ſuburbicary Churches; as Primate of the* Roman *Dioceſe. Of the* Cyprian *Priviledge; that it was not peculiar, but common to all Primats of Dioceſes. Of the Pope's Primacy according to the Canons, how far pertinent to our diſpute. How far the Pope's Confirmation requiſite to new elected Patriarchs. Of the Synodical and Communicatory Letters. The teſtimonies of* Petrus de Marcâ *concerning the Pope's Power of confirming and depoſing Biſhops. The Inſtances brought for it, conſidered. The caſe of* Athanaſius *being reſtored by* Julius, *truly ſtated. The proceedings of* Conſtantine *in the caſe of the Donatiſts cleared, and the evidence thence againſt the Pope's Supremacy. Of the Appeals of Biſhops to* Rome, *how far allowed by the Canons of the Church. The great caſe of Appeals between the* Roman *and* African *Biſhops diſcuſſed. That the Appeals of Biſhops were prohibited, as well as thoſe of the inferiour Clergy.* T. C.*'s fraud in citing the Epiſtle of the* African *Biſhops, for acknowledging Appeals to* Rome. *The contrary manifeſted from the ſame Epiſtle to* Boniface, *and the other to* Cœleſtine. *The exemption of the Ancient Britannick Church from any ſubjection to the See of* Rome, *aſſerted. The caſe of* Wilfrids *Appeal anſwered. The Primacy of* England *not derived from* Gregory*'s Grant to* Auguſtine *the Monk. The Ancient Primacy of the Britannick Church not loſt upon the Saxon Converſion. Of the ſtate of the* African *Churches, after their denying Appeals to* Rome. *The riſe of the Pope's Greatneſs under Chriſtian Emperours. Of the Decree of the Sardican Synod, in caſe of Appeals, whether ever received by the Church: No evidence thence of the Pope's Supremacy.* Zoſimus *his forgery in ſending the Sardican Canons inſtead of the Nicene. The weakneſs of the Pleas for it, manifeſted.* P. 357

CHAP. VI.

Of the Title of Univerſal Biſhop.

In what ſenſe the Title of Univerſal Biſhop was taken in Antiquity. A threefold acceptation of it; as importing 1. *A general care over the Chriſtian Churches, which is attributed to other Catholick Biſhops by Antiquity, beſides the Biſhop of* Rome, *as is largely proved.* 2. *A peculiar dignity over the Churches within the Roman Empire. This accounted then Oecumenical, thence the Biſhops of the ſeat of the Empire called Oecumenical Biſhops: and ſometimes of other Patriarchal Churches.* 3. *Noting Univerſal Juriſdiction over the whole Church as Head of it, ſo never given in Antiquity to the Biſhop of* Rome. *The ground of the Conteſt about this Title between the Biſhops of* Rome *and* Conſtantinople. *Of the proceedings of the Council of* Chalcedon, *about the Popes Supremacy. Of the Grammatical and Metaphorical ſenſe of this Title. Many arguments to prove it impoſſible that S.* Gregory *ſhould underſtand it in the Grammatical ſenſe. The great abſurdities conſequent upon it. S.* Gregory*'s Reaſons proved to hold againſt that ſenſe of it, which is admitted in the Church of* Rome. *Of* Irenæus *his oppoſition to* Victor. Victor*'s excommunicating the* Aſian *Biſhops, argues no authority he had over them. What the more powerful principality in* Irenæus *is.* Ruffinus

Ruffinus *his Interpretation of the 6 Nicene Canon vindicated. The Suburbicary Churches cannot be understood of all the Churches in the Roman Empire. The Pope no Infallible Successour of S.* Peter, *nor so acknowledged to be by* Epiphanius. *S.* Peter *had no Supremacy of Power over the Apostles.* p. 391

CHAP. VII.

The Popes Authority not proved from Scripture, or Reason.

The insufficiency of the proofs from Scripture, acknowledged by Romanists themselves. The impertinency of Luk. 22. 32. *to that purpose. No proofs offered for it, but the suspected testimonies of Popes in their own cause. That no Infallibility can thence come to the Pope, as S.* Peters *Successour, confessed, and proved by* Vigorius, *and Mr.* White. *The weakness of the evasion of the Popes erring as a private Doctor, but not as Pope, acknowledged by them.* Joh. 21. 15. *proves nothing towards the Popes Supremacy. How far the Popes Authority is owned by the Romanists over Kings.* T. C.*'s beggings of the Question, and tedious repetitions, past over. The Argument from the necessity of a living Judge, considered. The Government of the Church not Monarchical, but Aristocratical. The inconveniencies of Monarchical Government in the Church, manifested from reason. No evidence that Christ intended to institute such Government in his Church, but much against it. The Communicatory letters in the primitive Church, argued an Aristocracy.* Gersons *testimony from his Book* de Auferibilitate Papæ, *explained and vindicated. S.* Hieroms *testimony full against a Monarchy in the Church. The inconsistency of the Popes Monarchy with that of temporal Princes. The Supremacy of Princes in Ecclesiastical matters, asserted by the Scripture and Antiquity as well as the Church of* England. p. 418

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Council of *Trent.*

The Illegality of it manifested, first from the insufficiency of the Rule it proceeded by, different from that of the first General Councils, and from the Popes Presidency in it. The matter of Right concerning it, discussed. In what Cases Superiours may be excepted against as Parties. The Pope justly excepted against as a Party, and therefore ought not to be Judge. The Necessity of a Reformation in the Court of Rome, *acknowledged by Roman Catholicks. The matter of fact enquired into, as to the Popes Presidency in General Councils.* Hosius *did not preside in the Nicene Council as the Popes Legat. The Pope had nothing to do in the second General Council. Two Councils held at* Constantinople, *within two years; these strangely confounded. The mistake made evident. S.* Cyril *not President in the third General Council as the Popes Legat. No sufficient evidence of the Popes Presidency in following Councils. The justness of the Exception against the place, manifested; and against the freedom of the Council from the Oath taken by the Bishops to the Pope. The form of that Oath in the time of the Council of* Trent. *Protestants not condemned by General Councils. The Greeks and others unjustly excluded as Schismaticks. The exception from the small number of Bishops cleared and vindicated. A General Council in Antiquity not so called from the Popes General Summons. In what sense a General Council represents the whole Church. The vast difference between the proceedings in the Council of* Nice, *and that at* Trent. *The exception from the number of Italian Bishops, justified. How far the Greek Church and the Patriarch* Hieremias *may be said to condemn Protestants; with an account of the proceedings between them.* p. 440

PART

PART III.
Of Particular Controverſies.

CHAP. I.
Of the Infallibility of General Councils.

HOw far this tends to the ending Controverſies. Two diſtinct Queſtions concerning the Infallibility, and Authority of General Councils. The firſt entred upon, with the ſtate of the Queſtion. That there can be no certainty of faith that General Councils are infallible; nor that the particular decrees of any of them are ſo: which are largely proved. Pighius *his Arguments againſt the Divine Inſtitution of General Councils. The places of Scripture conſidered, which are brought for the Churches infallibility, and that theſe cannot prove that General Councils are ſo;* Matth. 18. 20. Acts 15. 28. *particularly anſwered. The ſenſe of the Fathers in their high expreſſions of the decrees of Councils. No conſent of the Church as to their infallibility. The place of St.* Auſtin *about the amendment of former General Councils by latter, at large vindicated. No other places in S.* Auſtin *prove them infallible, but many to the contrary. General Councils cannot be infallible in the concluſion, if not in the uſe of the means. No ſuch infallibility, without as immediate a revelation as the Prophets and Apoſtles had: taking Infallibility not for an abſolute unerring power, but ſuch as comes by a promiſe of Divine Aſſiſtance preſerving from errour. No obligation to internal aſſent, but from immediate Divine Authority. Of the conſiſtency of Faith and reaſon in things propounded to be believed. The ſuitableneſs of the contrary Doctrine to the Romaniſts principles.* p. 469

CHAP. II.
Of the uſe and Authority of General Councils.

The denying the Infallibility of General Councils takes not away their uſe and Authority. Of the ſubmiſſion due to them by all particular perſons. How far external obedience is required in caſe they err. No violent oppoſition to be made againſt them. Rare Inconveniences hinder not the effect of a juſt power. It cannot rationally be ſuppoſed, that ſuch General Councils as are here meant ſhould often or dangerouſly err. The true notion of a General Council explained. The Freedom requiſite in the proceedings of it. The Rule it muſt judge by. Great difference between external obedience, and internal aſſent to the Decrees of Councils. This later unites men in error, not the former. As great uncertainties ſuppoſing General Councils Infallible as not. Not ſo great certainty requiſite for ſubmiſſion as Faith. Whether the Romaniſts Doctrine of the Infallibility of Councils, or ours, tend more to the Churches peace? St. Auſtin *explained. The Keyes according to him given to the Church. No unremediable inconvenience, ſuppoſing a General Council err. But errors in Faith are ſo, ſuppoſing them Infallible when they are not. The Church hath power to reverſe the Decrees of General Councils. The power of Councils not by Divine Inſtitution. The unreaſonableneſs of making the Infallibility of Councils depend on the Popes confirmation. No conſent among the Romaniſts about the ſubject of Infallibility, whether in Pope or Council. No evidence from Scripture, Reaſon, or Antiquity, for the Popes perſonal Infallibility.* p. 496

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the errors of pretended General Councils.

The erroneous Doctrine of the Church of Rome *in making the Priests intention necessary to the essence of Sacraments. That principle destructive to all certainty of Faith upon our Authors grounds. The absurdity of asserting that Councils define themselves to be Infallible. Sacramental actions sufficiently distinguished from others without the Priests Intention. Of the moral assurance of the Priests Intention, and the insufficiency of a meer virtual Intention. The Popes confirmation of Councils supposeth personal Infallibility. Transubstantiation an error decreed by Pope and Council. The repugnancy of it to the grounds of Faith. The Testimonies brought for it out of Antiquity examined at large, and shewed to be far from proving Transubstantiation. Communion in one kind a violation of Christs Institution. The Decree of the Council of* Constance *implyes a* non obstante *to it. The unalterable nature of Christs Institution cleared. The several evasions considered and answered. No publick Communion in one kind for a thousand years after Christ. The indispensableness of Christs Institution owned by the Primitive Church. Of Invocation of Saints, and the Rhetorical expressions of the Fathers which gave occasion to it. No footsteps of the Invocation of Saints in the three first Centuries; nor precept or example in Scripture as our Adversaries confess. Evidences against Invocation of Saints from the Christians Answers to the Heathens. The worship of Spirits and Heroes among the Heathens justifiable on the same grounds that Invocation of Saints is in the Church of* Rome. *Commemoration of the Saints without Invocation, in S.* Augustins *time. Invocation of Saints as practised in the Church of* Rome *a derogation to the merits of Christ. Of the worship of Images, and the near approach to Pagan Idolatry therein. No use or Veneration of Images in the Primitive Church. The Church of* Rome *justly chargeable with the abuses committed in the worship of Images.* p. 515

CHAP. IV.

Of the possibility of Salvation in the *Roman* Church.

***Protestants** Concessions ought not to be any ground to prefer the Communion of the Church of* Rome. *How far those Concessions extend. The uncharitableness of Romanists, if they yield not the same to us. The weakness of the Arguments to prove the* Roman *Church the safer way to salvation on Protestant Principles. The dangerous Doctrines of Romanists about the easiness of salvation, by the Sacrament of Penance. The case parallel'd between the Donatists and the Romanists, in denying salvation to all but themselves; and the advantages equal from their adversaries Concessions. The advantage of the Protestants, if that be the safest way which both parties are agreed in, manifested and vindicated in several particulars. The Principle it self at large shewed to be a meer contingent Proposition, and such as may lead to Heresie and Infidelity. The case of the Leaders in the* Roman *Church, and others, distinguished. The Errours and Superstitions of the* Roman *Church, make its communion very dangerous in order to Salvation.* p. 568

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The Safety of the Proteſtant Faith.

The ſufficiency of the Proteſtant Faith to Salvation, manifeſted by diſproving the Cavils againſt it. T. C.*'s tedious Repetitions paſſed over. The Argument from Poſſeſſion at large conſider'd. No Preſcription allowable, where the Law hath antecedently determined the right. Of the Infallibility of Oral Tradition. That, contrary to the received Doctrine of the* Roman *Church; and in it ſelf unreaſonable. The Grounds of it examined. The ridiculouſneſs of the Plea of bare Poſſeſſion, diſcovered. General Anſwers returned to the remaining Chapters, conſiſting wholly of things already diſcuſſed. The place of S.* Cyprian *to* Cornelius *particularly vindicated. The proof of Succeſſion of Doctrine lyes on the Romaniſts by their own Principles.* p. 581

CHAP. VI.

The Senſe of the Fathers concerning Purgatory.

The Advantage which comes to the Church of Rome, *by the Doctrine of Purgatory, thence the boldneſs of our Adverſaries in contending for it. The Senſe of the* Roman *Church concerning Purgatory, explained. The Controverſie between the Greek and Latin Church concerning it. The Difference in the Church of* Rome *about Purgatory. Some general Conſiderations about the Senſe of the Fathers, as to its being an Article of Faith. The Doubtfulneſs and Uncertainty of the Fathers Judgements in this particular, manifeſted by S.* Auſtin *the firſt who ſeemed to aſſert a Purgation before the day of Judgement. Prayer for the Dead uſed in the Ancient Church, doth not inferr Purgatory. The Primate of* Armagh *vindicated from our Adverſaries Calumnies. The general Intention of the Church diſtinguiſhed from the private Opinions of particular perſons. The Prayers of the Church reſpected the day of Judgement. The Teſtimonies of the Fathers in behalf of Purgatory, examined; particularly of the pretended* Dionyſius, Tertullian, *S.* Cyprian, Origen, *S.* Ambroſe, *S.* Hierom, *S.* Baſil, Nazianzen, Lactantius, Hilary, Gregory Nyſſen, &c. *And not one of them aſſerts the Purgatory of the Church of* Rome. *S.* Auſtin *doth not contradict himſelf about it. The Doctrine of Purgatory no elder than* Gregory 1. *and built on Credulity and Superſtition. The Churches Infallibility made at laſt the Foundation of the belief of Purgatory. The Falſity of that Principle: and the whole concluded.* p. 591

PART

PART I.

Of the Grounds of Faith.

CHAP. I.

The Occaſion of the Conference, and Defence of the Greek Church.

T. C's. *Title examined and retorted. The Labyrinth found in his Book and Doctrine. The occaſion of the Conference about the Churches infallibility. The riſe of the diſpute about the* Greek Church, *and the conſequences from it. The charge of Hereſie againſt the Greek Church examined, and ſhe found, Not-guilty, by the concurrent teſtimony of Fathers, General Councils, and Popes. Of the Council of* Florence *and the proceedings there; That Council neither General nor Free. The diſtinction of Ancient and Modern Greeks diſproved. The debate of the* Filioque *being inſerted into the Creed. The time when and the right by which it was done, diſcuſſed. The riſe of the Schiſm between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches, mainly occaſioned by the Church of* Rome.

§. 1. THat which is the common ſubtilty of *Malefactors*, to derive, if poſſible, the imputation of that fault on the perſons of their Accuſers, which they are moſt liable to be charged with themſelves, is the great Artifice made uſe of by you in the *Title* and *Deſign* of your *Book*. For there being nothing which your Party is more juſtly accuſed for, than involving and perplexing the grounds of Chriſtian Faith under a pretext of Infallibility in your Church you thought you could not better avoid the *odium* of it, than by a confident recrimination: And from hence it is that you call his Lordſhips Book a *Labyrinth*, and pretend to diſcover his *abſtruſe turnings*, *ambiguous windings* and *intricate Meanders*, as you are pleaſed to ſtile them. But thoſe who will take the pains to ſearch your Book for the *diſcoveries* made in it, will find themſelves little ſatisfied but only in *theſe*, that no cauſe can be ſo bad, but intereſſed perſons will plead for it; and no writing ſo clear and exact, but a perplexed mind will imagine nothing but *Meanders* in it. And if dark paſſages and intricate windings, if obſcure ſenſe and perplexed conſequences, if uncertain wandrings and frequent ſelf-contradictions may make a writing be call'd a *Labyrinth*, I know no Modern *Artiſt* who comes ſo near the skill of the *Cretan Artificer* as your ſelf. Neither is this meerly your own fault; but the nature of the *cauſe* whoſe defence you have

eſpouſed, is ſuch, as will not admit of being handled in any other manner. For you might aſſoon hope to perſwade a Traveller that his neareſt and ſafeſt way was through ſuch a *Labyrinth* as that of *Crete*, as convince us that the beſt and ſureſt Reſolution of our Faith is into your *Churches Infallibility*. And while you give out, that all other grounds of *Chriſtian Faith* are uncertain, and yet are put to ſuch miſerable ſhifts in defence of your own, inſtead of eſtabliſhing the Faith of *Chriſtians*, you expoſe *Chriſtianity* it ſelf to the ſcorn and contempt of *Atheiſts*; who need nothing more to confirm them in their *Infidelity*, than ſuch a ſenſeleſs and unreaſonable way of proceeding as you make uſe of, for laying the Foundations of *Chriſtian Faith*. Your great Principle being, that no Faith can be Divine, but what is Infallible; and none Infallible, but what is built on a Divine and Infallible Teſtimony; and that this Teſtimony is only that of the preſent Catholick Church; and that Church none but yours: and yet after all this you dare not ſay the Teſtimony of your Church is *Divine*, but only *in a ſort* and *after a manner*. You pretend that our Faith is vain and uncertain, becauſe built only on Moral certainty and Rational evidence; and yet you have no other proof for your Churches Infallibility, but the motives of credibility. You offer to prove the Churches Infallibility independently on *Scripture*; and yet challenge no other Infallibility but what comes by the promiſe and aſſiſtance of the *Holy-Ghoſt*, which depends wholly on the Truth of the *Scripture*. You ſeek to diſparage *Scripture* on purpoſe to advance your *Churches Authority*, and yet bring your greateſt evidences of the *Churches Authority* from it. By which *Authority* of the *Church* you often tell us that *Chriſtian Religion* can only be proved to be Infallibly true, when if but one error be found in your *Church*, her Infallible Teſtimony is gone, and what becomes then of *Chriſtian Religion?* And all this is managed with a peculiar regard to the Intereſt of *your Church*, as the only *Catholick Church*, which you can never attempt to prove but upon ſuppoſition of the *Truth* of *Chriſtianity*, the belief of which yet you ſay depends upon your *Churches* being the *True* and *Catholick Church*. Theſe, and many other ſuch as theſe will be found the rare and coherent Principles of your Faith and Doctrine, which I have here only given this taſte of, that the Reader may ſee with what honour to your ſelf and advantage to your Cauſe, you have beſtowed the *Title* of *Labyrinth* on his *Lordſhips Book*.

But yet you might be pardonable, if rather through the weakneſs of your Cauſe, than your ill management of it, you had brought us into theſe amazing *Labyrinths*; if you had left us any thing whereby we might hope to be ſafely directed in our paſſage through them: Whereas you not only endeavour to put men out of the True way, but uſe your greateſt induſtry to keep them from a poſſibility of returning into it: by not only ſuggeſting falſe Principles to them, but decrying the uſe of thoſe things which ſhould diſcover their falſity. For although the judgement of ſenſe were that which the *Apoſtles* did appeal to (*that which we have ſeen and*
1 Joh. 1. 1, 3. *heard —— declare we unto you*); although that were the greateſt and ſureſt evidence to them of the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt*; although *Chriſt* himſelf
Mark 16. 14. *condemned them for their unbelief and hardneſs of heart, becauſe they believed not them which had ſeen him after he was riſen*; yet according to your Principles men muſt have a care of relying on the judgement of ſenſe in matters of Faith, leſt perchance, they ſhould not believe that great *Affront* to humane Nature, the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Neither are men only deprived of the judgement of ſenſe, but of the concurrent uſe of *Scripture* and *Reaſon*; for theſe are pretended to be uncertain, fallible, nay, dangerous without the Churches Infallibility: So that the ſhort of your grounds of eſtabliſhing Faith, is, If we will find our way, we muſt renounce

the

the judgement of ſenſe and reaſon, ſubmit our ſelves and Scripture to an *Infallible Guide*, and then you tell us we cannot miſs of our way; when it is impoſſible for us to know our *Guide*, without the uſe of thoſe things which we are bid to renounce. Theſe things laid together make us admire more at your *confidence* than *invention* in making the current title of your Book to be *Dr. Laud's Labyrinth*, in which it is hard to ſay, whether your immodeſty or blindneſs be the greater.

§. 2. But as though you were the only *Heroes* for aſſerting the *Chriſtian Cauſe*, and all others but more *ſubtle betrayers* of it, you begin your Book with a moſt ingenious compariſon *of the learned labours of thoſe of your Church to the ſtately Temple of* Solomon; *and the artificial but peſtiferous works of all Heretical Authors* (i. e. all but your ſelves) *to Labyrinths and intricate Dungeons.* p. 1. In which only your diſcretion is to be commended, in placing this at the entrance of your Book; for whoſoever looks but further into it, and compares it with that you pretend to anſwer, will not condemn the choice of your Similitudes, but your forgetfulneſs in miſapplying them. But it matters not what titles you give to the books of our *Authors*, unleſs you were better able to confute them: and if no other book of any late *Proteſtant* Writer hath been any more diſcovered to be *of this intangling nature*, than this of his Lordſhip (whom you call *our grand Author*) is by you, you may very juſtly ſay of them as you do in the next words, *they are very liable to the ſame Reproach*: p. 2. In which we commend your ingenuity, that when you had ſo lately diſparaged our Authors and Writings, you ſo ſuddenly wipe off thoſe *Aſperſions* again by giving them the deſerved name of *Reproaches*. When you ſay his Lordſhips Book *is moſt artificially compoſed*, we have reaſon to believe ſo fair a Teſtimony from a profeſſed Adverſary; but when notwithſtanding this you call it a *Labyrinth*, we can interpret it only as a fair plea for your not being able to anſwer it. And who can blame you for calling that a *Labyrinth* in which you have ſo miſerably loſt your ſelf? But, in pity to you, and juſtice to the cauſe I have undertaken, I ſhall endeavour with all kindneſs and fairneſs to reduce you out of your ſtrange entanglements into the plain and eaſie paths of Truth; which I doubt not to effect by your own Clew *of Scripture and Tradition*, by which you may ſoon diſcover what a *Labyrinth* you were in your ſelf, when you had thought to have made *directive Marks* (as you call them) for others to avoid it.

§. 3. To omit therefore any further preface, I ſhall wait upon you to particulars; the firſt of which is, *the Occaſion of the Conference, which* (you ſay) p. 2. *was for the ſatisfaction of an honourable Lady, who having heard it granted in a former Conference, that there muſt be a continual viſible company ever ſince Chriſt teaching unchanged doctrine, in all points neceſſary to ſalvation; and finding* (it ſeems) *in her own reaſon that ſuch a company or Church muſt not be fallible in its teaching, was in queſt of a Continual, Viſible, Infallible Church, as not thinking it fit for unlearned perſons to judge of particular doctrinals, but to depend on the judgement of the true Church.* The Queſtion then was not concerning a *Continual* and *Viſible Church*, which you acknowledge was granted, but concerning ſuch a *Church* as muſt be *infallible* in all ſhe teaches, (and, if ſhe be infallible, according to your doctrine of Fundamentals, whatever ſhe teaches is neceſſary to ſalvation) which that *Lady* thought neceſſary to be firſt determined, becauſe, ſaith *Mr. Fiſher, It was not for her, or any other unlearned perſons, to take upon them to judge of particulars, without depending upon the judgement of the true Church*; which ſeeming to allow of ſome uſe of our own judgement, ſuppoſing the Churches Authority, you pervert into theſe words, *Not thinking it fit to judge, &c. but to depend, &c.* But let them be as they will, unleſs you gave greater reaſon for them, it is not material which way they

paſs. For his *Lordſhip* had returned a ſufficient Anſwer to that pretence
P. 2. ſect. 2. (which you are content to take no notice of) in ſaying *That it is very fit the people ſhould look to the judgement of the Church before they be too buſie with particulars. But yet neither Scripture, nor any good Authority denies them ſome moderate uſe of their own underſtanding and judgement, eſpecially in things familiar and evident, which even ordinary capacities may as eaſily underſtand as read. And therefore ſome particulars a Chriſtian may judge without depending.* To which *you*, having nothing to ſay, run poſt to the buſineſs of *Infallibility*: for when it was ſaid, *The Lady deſired to rely on an Infallible Church, therein*, his Lordſhip ſays, *neither the Jeſuite nor the Lady her ſelf ſpake very adviſedly: For an Infallible Church denotes a particular Church, in that it is ſet in oppoſition to ſome other particular Church that is not infallible.*
P. 3. ſect. 3. n. 2. Here now you begin your diſcoveries: for you tell us, *he makes this his firſt crook in his projected Labyrinth; which is apparent to any man that has eyes, even without the help of a Perſpective.* As ſeldome as *Perſpectives* are uſed to diſcern the turns of *Labyrinths*, nothing is ſo apparent, as that your eyes or your judgement were not very good when you uſed this expreſſion. For I pray, what *crook* or *turn* is there in that, when a *Lady* demanded an *Infallible Church* to her *guide*, to ſay, that by that queſtion ſhe ſuppoſeth *ſome particular Church* as diſtinct from, and oppoſite to others, to be *infallible*? No, ſay you, *ſhe ſought not any one particular Church infallible; in oppoſition to another Church not infallible; but ſome Church, ſuch as might without danger of errour direct her in all doctrinal points of Faith.* Rarely well diſtinguiſh'd! Not *any* particular Church, but *ſome* particular Church. For if ſhe enquired after *ſome Church, which, without danger of errour, might direct her in all doctrinal points of Faith*, doth ſhe not thereby imply, that ſome other Church might bring her into danger of errour under pretence of directing her in matters of Faith? and if this be *ſome particular fallible Church*, the other muſt be *ſome particular infallible Church*? And is it poſſible to conceive ſome Church that may err in directing, and ſome other that may not err, without ſome particular Church being taken in oppoſition to ſome other Church? But you would fain perſwade us that the force of his Lordſhips argument reſts wholly *upon the importance of the particle* a *or* an, *which cannot be applyed but to particulars*, which you very learnedly diſprove: whereas the main ſtrength of what his Lordſhip ſays, depends upon the nature of the queſtion, and the manner of propoſing it. For the *Lady* enquiring after ſuch a *Church* whoſe judgement ſhe might rely on as to the matters in diſpute in the Chriſtian world, muſt mean ſuch a *Church* whoſe communion muſt be known as diſtinct from other *Churches* which are *not infallible*; for otherwiſe ſhe might be deceived ſtill. And if you give a pertinent anſwer to her queſtion, you muſt ſhew her ſome ſuch *Church* as an *Infallible Guide*, which can be no other in this caſe, but ſome particular Church conſidered as diſtinct from others. For a general anſwer concerning the Infallibility of the *Catholick Church*, without ſhewing how the Infallible judgement of that *Church* may be known, can by no means reach the caſe in hand: which doth not meerly reſpect an Infallibility in the ſubject, but ſuch an infallibility as may be a *ſufficient guide in all doctrinal points of Faith.*
Page 3. When you ſay therefore, *ſhe meant no other than the Univerſal viſible Church of Chriſt*, you muſt tell us how the *Univerſal viſible Church* can become ſuch an *Infallible guide* in the matters in Controverſie between thoſe *Churches*, which yet are *members* of that *Univerſal viſible Church*. For the notion of the *Univerſal Church* not being in its nature confined to any one of theſe parties, but all of them concurring to the making of it up, can no more be an *Infallible guide* in the *matters in difference*, than the common notion of *Animal* can direct us in judging

judging what Beings are *ſenſitive* and what *rational*. Therefore though you would fain deceive the world under a pretence of the *Catholick Church*, yet nothing can be more evident, than that in the queſtion what *Church* muſt be a *guide in Doctrinal points of Faith*, it muſt be underſtood of ſome *Church* as diſtinct from other *Churches*, which ought not to be relyed on as infallible guides. But the ſubtilty of this is, that when you challenge *Infallibility* to your *Church*, we ſhould not apprehend her as a *particular Church*, but as the *true Catholick Church*, which is a thing ſo every way abſurd and unreaſonable, that you had need uſe the greateſt Artifices to diſguiſe it, which yet can deceive none but ſuch as are reſolved to be deceived by them. For any one *who had his eyes in his head might diſcern without a Perſpective*, as you ſpeak, that *Churches* of ſeveral and diſtinct Communions from each other were placed in competition for *Infallibility*: For Mr. *Fiſher*'s next words are, The Queſtion was, *Which was that Church?* Do you think he means, Which was that *Univerſal viſible Church*? Certainly not: for the nature of the Queſtion ſuppoſes ſeveral *Churches*: now I think you do not believe, there are ſeveral *Univerſal viſible Churches*. And it immediately follows, *A Friend of the Ladies would needs defend that not only the Roman, but the Greek Church was right*; to which Mr. *Fiſher* anſwers, *That the Greek Church had erred in matter of Doctrine*. Can any thing be more plain than that this *Queſtion* doth relate to *Churches* conſidered ſeverally and as under diſtinct Communions and Denominations? And therefore notwithſtanding your pitiful pretences to the contrary, this Queſtion can be no otherwiſe underſtood than, as his Lordſhip ſaid, *of ſome particular Infallible Church, in oppoſition to ſome other particular Church which is not Infallible*. And if you judge this *an affected miſtake* as you call it, *your diſcerning faculty* will be as liable to Queſtion as your Churches Infallibility.

§. 4. That you might ſeem to avoid the better the force of his Lordſhips following diſcourſe againſt *Bellarmine* about the Infallibility of the particular *Church* of *Rome*; you firſt tell us, *That it is ſufficient for a Catholick to believe that there is an Infallibility in the Church, without further obligation to examine whether the particular Church of Rome be infallible or no.* Which is an egregious piece of Sophiſtry. For, put caſe a man believes the *Catholick Church* of *all Ages* Infallible, but not of *any one particular Age* ſince the *Apoſtles* times; ſuppoſe a man believe the *Catholick Church* of the *preſent Age* Infallible, but not of *any one particular Communion* but as it takes in thoſe common truths wherein they are all agreed; will you ſay this is ſufficient for a *Catholick* to believe without obligation to examine further? If you will, ſpeak it out, and, I dare ſay, you ſhall not have much thanks at *Rome* when you have done it. But the myſtery is, If a man believes the *Roman Church* only, to be the *Catholick Church*, it is no matter whether he enquires whether the *Catholick Church* be only at *Rome* or no. It is not the place, but the communion of the *Roman Church* which is now enquired after in the queſtion of *Infallibility*; although I cannot ſee but thoſe places out of the *Fathers* which are produced to prove the *Roman Church* Infallible, will hold for the continuance of that Infallibility in that particular place of *Rome*. For St. *Cyprian* ſaith expreſly of the *Romans*, *that they are ſuch to whom Perfidia* (what ever be meant by it) *cannot have acceſs*. St. *Jerome* ſaith, *The Roman Faith admits no deceits into it*. *Gregory Nazianzene*, that *Rome retains the ancient Faith*. Not that I think any of theſe places do in the leaſt import the Infallibility of the *Roman Church* (as will be ſhewed in its proper place) but that, on ſuppoſition that *Infallibility* were implyed in them, they would hold for the *Infallibility* of the particular *Roman Church*.

Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram, & Eccleſiam Principalem, &c. nec cogitare, eos eſſe Romanos ad quos perfidia habere non poteſt acceſſum. Cypr. l. 1. c. 3. *Scito, Romanam fidem ejuſmodi prævigilia non recipere.* Hierony. Apol. 3. c. Ruff. *Roma ſemper fidem retinet.* Greg. Nazianz. carm. de vitâ ſuâ.

And

And therefore *Bellarmin* underſtood what he did when he produced theſe places to that purpoſe, eſpecially the *Apoſtolical See* remaining at *Rome*, as he ſuppoſeth himſelf in this part of the *Queſtion* which he there diſcuſſeth. Either therefore you muſt aſſert that which his Lordſhip learnedly proves, *viz.* That no ſuch thing as Infallibility is intended by any of theſe Citations, or elſe that it muſt extend to the particular *Roman Church*. And when you deny this *to be an Article of Faith among Catholicks, that the particular Roman Church* (the Apoſtolical See remaining there) *is Infallible*, prove at your leiſure from any of theſe Citations that the *Church* within the *Roman Communion* is Infallible and not the particular *Roman Church*. And from what hath been hitherto ſaid, I am ſo far from ſuſpecting *his Lordſhips candour*, as you do, that I much rather ſuſpect your judgement, and that you are not much uſed to attend to the Conſequences of things, or elſe you would not have deſerted *Bellarmin* in defence of ſo neceſſary and pertinent a point as the *Infallibility* of the particular *Church* of *Rome*.

Bellarm. de Pontific. Rom. l. 4. c. 4. ſect. 1.

Pag. 4. Secondly, You anſwer to his Lordſhips Diſcourſe concerning *Bellarmin*'s Authorities, *That you cannot hold your ſelf obliged to take notice of his pretended Solutions, till you find them brought to evacuate the Infallibility of the Catholick or the Roman Church in its full latitude, as Catholicks ever mean it, ſave when they ſay the particular Church of Rome.* But taking it in as full a Latitude as you pleaſe, I doubt not but to make it appear that the *Roman Church* is the *Roman Church* ſtill, that is, a particular *Church* as diſtinct from the Communion of others, and therefore neither *Catholick* nor *Infallible*: which I muſt refer to the place where you inſiſt upon it, which I ſhall do without the imitation of your Vanity, in telling your Reader as far as *eighthly and laſtly* what fine exploits you intend to do there. But uſually thoſe who brag moſt of their Valour before-hand ſhew leaſt in the Combat, and thus it will be found with you. I ſhall let you therefore enjoy your ſelf in the pleaſant thoughts of your noble intendments, till we come to the tryal of them; and ſo come to the preſent controverſie concerning the *Greek Church*.

The Defence of the Greek Church.

§. 5. It is none of the leaſt of thoſe Arts which you make uſe of for the *perplexing* the *Chriſtian Faith*, to put men upon enquiring after an *Infallible Church*, when yet you have no way to diſcern which is ſo much as a *true Church*, but by examining the *doctrine* of it. So that of neceſſity the rule of Faith and Doctrine muſt be certainly known, before ever any one can with ſafety depend upon the judgement of any *Church*. For having already proved that there can be no other meaning of the Queſtion concerning the *Church*, as here ſtated, but with relation to *ſome particular Church* to whoſe Communion the party enquiring might joyn, and whoſe judgement might be relyed on; we ſee it preſently follows in the debate, *Which was that Church*; and it ſeems, as is ſaid already, *a Friend of the Ladies undertook to defend* P. 21. ſect. 4. *that the Greek Church was right*. To which Mr. *Fiſher* anſwers, *That the Greek Church had plainly changed, and taught falſe in a point of Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghoſt*: and after repeats it, *that it had erred*. Before I come to examine how you make good the charge you draw up againſt the poor *Greek Church* in making it *err fundamentally*, it is worth our while to conſider upon what account this diſpute comes in. The Inquiry was concerning the *True Church* on whoſe judgement one might ſafely depend in *Religion*. It ſeems, two were propounded to conſideration, the *Greek* and the *Roman*; the *Greek* was rejected *becauſe it had erred*: From whence it follows, that the diſpute concerning the *Truth* of *Doctrine* muſt neceſſarily precede *that* of the *Church*: For by Mr. *Fiſhers* confeſſion and your own, *A*

Church

Church which hath erred cannot be relyed on; therefore men must be satisfied whether a *Church* hath *erred* or no, before they can judge whether she may be relyed on or no. Which being granted, all the whole *Fabrick* of your Book falls to the ground; for then 1. Men must be *Infallibly certain* of the *grounds* of *Faith* antecedently to the *testimony of the Church*: for if they be to judge of a *Church* by the *Doctrine*, they must in order to such a judgement be certain what that *Doctrine* is which they must judge of the *Church* by. 2. No *Church* can be known to be *Infallible*, unless it appear to be so by that *Doctrine* which they are to examine the truth of the *Church* by, and therefore no *Church* can be known to be Infallible by the *motives of credibility*. 3. No *Church* ought to be relyed on as *Infallible*, which may be found guilty of any errour by comparing it with the *Doctrine* which we are to try it by. Therefore you must first prove your *Church* not to have erred in any particular; for if she hath, it is impossible she should be Infallible: and not think to prove that she *hath not erred* because *she cannot*, that being the thing in question, and must by your dealing with the *Greek Church* be judged by particulars. 4. There must be a *certain rule of Faith* supposed to have sufficient *Authority* to decide *Controversies* without any dependence upon the *Church*. For, the matter to be judged is the *Church*; and if the *Scripture* may and must decide that, Why may it not as well all the rest? 5. Every mans *reason* proceeding according to this *rule of Faith* must be left his *Judge* in *matters of Religion*. And whatever inconveniencies you can imagine to attend upon this, they immediately and necessarily follow from your proceeding with the *Greek Church* by excluding her because she hath erred, which while we are in pursuit of a *Church* can be determined by nothing but every ones particular reason. 6. Then *Fundamentals* do not depend upon the *Churches declaration*. For you assert the *Greek Church* to err fundamentally, and that this may be made appear to one who is seeking after a *Church*. Suppose then I inquire, as the *Lady* did, after a *Church* whose judgement I must absolutely depend on, and some mention the *Greek* and others the *Roman Church*: You tell me, It cannot be the *Greek*, *for that hath erred fundamentally*. I inquire how you know, supposing her to err, that it is a fundamental errour? will you answer me, *because the true Church hath declared it to be a fundamental errour*? but that was it I was seeking for Which that *Church* is, which may declare what errours are fundamental and what not? If you tell me *It is yours*, I may soon tell you, You seem to have a greater kindness for your *Church* than *your self*, and venture to speak any thing for the sake of it. Thus we see how finely you have betrayed your whole Cause in your first onset, by so rude an attempt upon the *Greek Church*.

And truly it was much your concernment, to load her as much as you can: For though she now wants one of the great marks of your *Church* (which yet you know not how long your *Church* may enjoy) *viz. outward splendour and bravery*, yet you cannot deny, but that *Church* was planted by the *Apostles*, enjoyed a continual *Succession* from them, flourished with a number of the *Fathers* exceeding that of yours, had more of the *Councils* of greatest credit in it, and, which is a commendation still to it, it retains more purity under its persecutions than your *Church* with all its *external splendour*. *But she hath erred concerning the Holy Ghost, and therefore hath lost it.* A severe censure which his Lordship rebukes Mr. *Fisher* for citing King *James* so boldly for: *but two ways it may be taken*, he adds. 1. *To lose such assistance as preserves from all errour.* 2. Or else *from all fundamental errour*, this therefore, his Lordship truly saith, *is an errour of the first sort and not of the latter.* P. 5. n. 4. P. 25. n. 17. sect. 5.

Passing

§. 6. Passing by therefore his Lordships expressions of his modesty, which if an *errour* is one *you* are like to be secured from; and his cautious expressions concerning the *Greek Church* which he highly shewed his *prudence* in, we come to consider how you prove the *Greek Church* guilty of fundamental errour. You say, *You pass by his trifling, and make way for it.* I wonder not to see you reflect on his Lordship for his *modesty*, considering how little of it you shew towards him; let us then *make way* too, but it is to see *you* and *Truth* combat together. *It is to be considered*, say you, *that*

P. 5. n. 4. *now for many hundred years, the whole Latine Church hath decreed and believed it to be flat Heresie in the Greeks; and they decreed the contrary to be an Heresie in the Latin Church, and both together condemned the opinion of the Grecians as Heretical in a General Council* (*in* Florentino) *how then bears it any shew of probability, what some few of yesterday* (*forced to it by an impossibility of otherwise avoiding the strength of Catholick arguments against them*) *affirm, that the matter of this Controversie was so small and inconsiderable, that it is not sufficient to produce an Heresie on either side? Is not this to make all the Churches of Christendome for many hundred years quite blind, and themselves only clear and sharp-sighted? which swelling presumption what spirit it argues, and whence it proceeds, all those who have learn'd from St.* Augustin *that Pride is the mother of Heresie, will easily collect.* I grant this speech of St. *Augustin* to be true; only let it be added, that *Pride is likewise the Mother of making Heresies*, as will appear in this present Controversie; and whether we, who vindicate the *Greek Church* from *Heresie*, or you who would find the *Bill* against her (to keep her from any rivalship with your Church) be more guilty of *Pride* will be soon discovered; but sure you believe us not only to be *men of yesterday*, but *to know nothing* who should sentence the *Greek Church* for *Heresie* upon such feeble pretences as these are. I know not what *presumption* that can be, to say, Men may be too forward on both sides in calling each other *Hereticks*, and it may be not so much their *Blindness*, as *Pride* and *Passion* which may make them do it. But if they will condemn that for *Heresie*, which is not so made appear to be upon any evidence from *Scripture* and *Reason*, they were not so blind in defining it, as we should be in following their judgement without further examination. *But this was for many hundred years.* The more to blame they, for continuing in so rash judgements so long, if it appear so. But it is well still you tell us, that *as the Latin Church condemned the Greek for Heresie, the Greek condemned the Latin for it too.* And so by your own rule the one was as blind as the other. *But the Latin Church had the right to determine Heresie, and the Greek had not.* This is the question, Which *Church* must be relyed on for judgement? and if they mutually condemn each other, we must have a higher *rule* to judge of both by. *But still, Is it not an Argument, that it is a Heresie of one side or the other, because each party condemns the other of Heresie?* Just as much, as if two men fall out and call each other *Knaves*, it must be granted, that if both be not, yet at least the one of them is so. *Heresie* being grown the *scolding word in Religion*; and no two parties can differ, but they seek to fasten this reproach on each other. If one should bring greater evidence than the other of his *Knavery*, he ought to be more accounted so. No otherwise can it be here; if sufficient proof be brought of Heresie on the one side and not the other, that party may be looked on as more guilty: but still remembring, that the more confident affirmation, the pretence to greater honesty and power, be not taken for the only evidences of it: As I doubt it will appear in our present case. But still suppose, that of two men who have so reproached each other, the one of them being fallen into distress and poverty, and not hoping for relief but from the other person, and he denying it, unless he be content by joynt-consent to be

be proclaimed *Knave*, which he through his neceſſity yielding to, but aſſoon as that is over declaring on what account they agreed; Muſt this man be more pitied for his Neceſſity, or condemned for his Knavery? Juſt ſuch I ſhall make it appear, that which you call condemning the *Grecians* as *Heretical* in a *General Council* at *Florence*, to have been and no otherwiſe.

But I come to a cloſer examination of this Subject to ſee with what Juſtice you charge the *Greek Church*, either with *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*; For both theſe you accuſe it of in this Chapter. Two things were the moſt in diſpute between the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*, the one was the *Doctrine* of the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from Father and Son*, the other was concerning the *addition* of the *Filióque* to the *Creed*. And although the *Greeks* in their debates at *Ferrara* would not meddle with the Doctrine, before the *Latins* could clear themſelves concerning the *addition*, which they ſaid was the main cauſe of the *Conteſt* between them; yet I am content to follow your method and handle the other firſt. Your diſcourſe concerning the firſt conſiſts of two parts, Proofs and Anſwers; *Proofs* of their *Hereſie*, and *Anſwers* to his Lordſhips *Arguments* againſt it. The Proofs are double, the one from *Authority*, the other from *Theological reaſon*. Through every of theſe particulars I ſhall follow you, and from them I doubt not to evince, that the *Greeks* are not guilty of the faults you lay to their charge. §. 7.

We have already ſeen what your Proofs from Authority are; their condemning one another for *Hereticks*, and the *Greeks* being condemned by a *General Council*. If I can therefore prove that the *Greeks* opinion was not accounted an *Hereſie* before the *Council* of *Florence*, and that it did not become a Hereſie by the *Council* of *Florence*, I ſhall ſufficiently diſcover the weakneſs of your Arguments from authority.

1. *That it was not accounted a Hereſie before the Council of* Florence; I mean not, that there were no hot-brain'd perſons in all the time of the difference, who did not brand the *Greek Church* with *Hereſie*, but that it was never accounted a *Hereſie*, by any of thoſe whom your ſelves account the only competent Judges of *Hereſie*; and thoſe are either the *Fathers*, or *Popes*, or *Councils*: which I prove in their order.

1. That it was not accounted Hereſie by the *Fathers*; which will be proved by theſe two things. 1. Becauſe it is very doubtful whether many of the *Fathers* did believe the Proceſſion of the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Son* or no. 2. Becauſe thoſe who did believe it, did not condemn thoſe of *Hereſie* who did not.

1. That it is very doubtful whether many of them did believe the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son or no*; at leaſt, ſo far as to make it *an Article of Faith*; for 1. There are clear teſtimonies that they make it unneceſſary to be believed. 2. The teſtimonies which ſeem to ſay, That they did believe it, do not neceſſarily imply that they did.

1. *That there are clear teſtimonies, that they did not account it a thing neceſſary to be believed*: both becauſe they in terms aſſerted the nature of this *proceſſion* to be *incomprehenſible*, and withal, did as clearly affirm the belief of that, which doth not imply this proceſſion to be ſufficient for ſalvation. 1. *They in terms aſſert, that the myſtery of this Proceſſion is incomprehenſible.* And can you, or any reaſonable man, imagine they ſhould make the manner of that *Proceſſion* to be an article of Faith, which they acknowledge to be abſolutely beyond our apprehenſion? I grant, Something ſuppoſed by them to be *incomprehenſible* is made an *article* of *Faith*: but then it is not *that* which is ſuppoſed as *incomprehenſible* under that notion, which is made ſo; but the *thing* it *ſelf* which may be *incomprehenſible*; yet being clearly revealed in *Scripture*, ought to be believed, notwithſtanding that incomprehenſibility

prehenſibility of it: As the *myſtery* of the *Trinity* it ſelf, the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son*, the *Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* from the *Father*, *&c.* But then I ſay, theſe things are ſuch, as are either declared by them to be expreſly revealed in *Scripture*, or neceſſarily conſequent from ſomething ſuppoſed to be ſo. As for inſtance, ſuppoſing the *Trinity* in *Unity* to be ſomething divinely revealed, whatever is neceſſarily conſequent from that, and is neceſſary to be believed in order to that, though it be *incomprehenſible*, muſt be believed; as, Suppoſing theſe two things clear from *Scripture*, that there is but one true *God*, and that there are *three Perſons*, who have the Name, Properties, and Attributes of *God* given to them, though our reaſon be too ſhort to fathom the manner how theſe can have three diſtinct *Subſiſtences*, and yet but one *Eſſence*, becauſe our reaſon (*i. e.* all thoſe conceptions which we have formed in our mind from the obſervation of things) doth tell us, that *Thoſe things which agree or diſagree in a third, agree or diſagree one with another*, and from thence it would inferr, that, if the *Father* be *God*, and the *Son God*, there could be no difference between *Father* and *Son*; yet this being meerly as to the connexion of two propoſitions, both of which are ſuppoſed diſtinctly revealed in *Scripture*; we are bound in this caſe to believe ſuch a *Connexion*, becauſe both parts are equally revealed by an *Infallible Teſtimony*, though the *Mode* of that *Connexion* be to us *Incomprehenſible*: But it is not ſo, where neither clear Revelation, nor a neceſſary Conſequent from ſomething which is divinely revealed doth inforce our belief of it. As in our preſent caſe: Since we ſuppoſe it revealed in *Scripture*, that *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt* are *God*, whatever is neceſſary to the belief of that, though *incomprehenſible*, we ought to believe it: but if there be ſomething without which I may believe the *Deity* of the *Father*, *Son* and *Spirit*, and this not clearly aſſerted in *Scripture*, but is a thing in it ſelf incomprehenſible, that cannot be made a neceſſary article of Faith: Thus that the *Spirit* doth proceed from the *Father ſeems* neceſſary on both accounts, as conſequent upon the belief of the *Trinity* in *Unity*, and as clearly expreſſed in *Scripture*: but that the *Spirit* ſhould proceed from *Father and Son* as from *one principle*, that they ſhould communicate in an action proper to their *Subſiſtences*, and yet be diſtinguiſhed from each other in thoſe *Subſiſtences*, and agree only in *Eſſence*, (and if the *Spirit* proceeds not from their *Subſiſtences*, but from the *Eſſence*, the *Spirit* muſt proceed from it ſelf, becauſe that is common to all three;) theſe things being in themſelves *incomprehenſible*, and not neceſſary to the belief of the *Divinity* either of *Son* or *Holy Ghoſt*, nor pretended to be clearly revealed in *Scripture*, cannot be ſaid to make a neceſſary article of Faith, the denyal of which muſt ſuppoſe *Hereſie*. And therefore that which is the only Objection in this caſe is removed, *viz.* that this *Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* from the Father is incomprehenſible, and yet ſuppoſed to be an article of *Faith*;

Joh. 15. 26. for that I have already ſhewed is expreſly revealed in *Scripture*, that *the Spirit doth proceed from the Father*. But neither is the proceſſion from the *Son* neceſſary to the belief of the *Deity* of the *Son*; for if it were, it would be as neceſſary to the *Deity* of the *Holy Ghoſt* that the *Son* ſhould be begotten by the *Spirit*; neither doth it follow from any place of *Scripture*, for all thoſe places which are uſually brought are very capable of ſuch interpretations, as do not at all infer it; from hence then it follows, that thoſe who upon theſe terms acknowledge this Proceſſion incomprehenſible, do therein imply that the belief of it is no article neceſſary to ſalvation, and therefore the denyal no Hereſie.

Now

Now for this we have the cleareſt teſtimonies of ſuch who were the greateſt and moſt zealous aſſertors of the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*. *Athanaſius* ſaith expreſly, *That it is ſufficient to know, that the Spirit is no creature, nor to be reckoned among Gods works; for nothing of another nature is mingled with the Trinity, but it is undivided, and like it ſelf: Theſe things are ſufficient for believers. But,* ſaith he, *when we come hither, the Cherubims vail their faces; but he that inquires and ſarches into more than theſe, neglects him that hath ſaid, Be not wiſe overmuch, &c.* If it be ſufficient to know, that the *Spirit* is no *creature*, it cannot be neceſſary to believe, that the *Spirit proceeds from the Son:* for they who do not believe that, do firmly believe the *Deity* of it. And if whatever goes beyond that, *goes beyond the bounds which God hath ſet us*, then certainly he never dreamt that men ſhould be condemned for *Hereſie* as to ſome things which cannot be ſuppoſed to be within them. To the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks St. *Baſil* in ſeveral places, acknowledging the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt to be a thing inexplicable*, and when the *Heretick* enquired of him *What kind of thing that Proceſſion was, when the Spirit was neither* ἀγέννητος, *nor yet* γεννητός, all the anſwer he gives them, is, *If there be ſuch multitudes of things in the world which we are ignorant of, what ſhame is it to confeſs our ignorance here?* And if it be here our duty to confeſs our ignorance, it is far from it to be Magiſterial and definitive, that unleſs men acknowledge every *punctilio*, they are guilty of Hereſie and fundamental Errors. St. *Gregory Nazianzene* mentioning that Queſtion, *What this Proceſſion is?* returns this Anſwer, *Tell me firſt what it is for the Father to be unbegotten, and I will explain the Generation of the Son, and Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; that we may both therein ſhew our folly, who pry into theſe Divine myſteries and do not know the things which are before our feet.* And elſewhere, *If we enquire into theſe things, what ſhall we leave to them, whom the Scripture tells us alone know and are known of each other?* St. *Cyrill* requires of men, *To believe his Being, and ſubſiſtence, and dominion over all; but for other things not to ſuffer the mind to go beyond the bounds allotted to humane nature.* Theſe ſpoke like *wiſe men*, and the true *Fathers* of the *Church*, who would have men content themſelves with believing meerly what was neceſſary in theſe deep and incomprehenſible myſteries, and not to make *Articles* of *Faith* of ſuch things which are not made neceſſary, either by deduction of Reaſon, or clear Divine *Revelation*. Although therefore I ſhould grant, that ſome or all of theſe, did themſelves believe this *Proceſſion* from the *Son*, yet hereby it appears they were far from impoſing it upon others, or making it a *Hereſie* in any not to believe it. They ſaw well theſe were not things to be narrowly ſearched into, but as the *Philoſopher* ſaid of ſome kind of *Hellebore*, *taken in the lump it is Medicinal, but beaten into powder is dangerous*, is true of theſe more abſtruſe myſteries of Religion; for whoſoever will endeavour to ſatisfie himſelf concerning them from the ſtrange niceties and ſubtilties of the *Schools*, may return with greater doubts than he went to them. For not to go beyond our preſent Subject, whoſoever would examine the way they take to make the *Proceſſion* to be immediate from the *Father* and the *Son*, ſo as to be from one principle, to ſhew how the *Spirit* comes from both by the ſame numerical *ſpiration*; but

Ἀρκεῖ γινώσκειν ὅτι μὴ κτίσμα ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα, μηδὲ τοῖς ποιήμασι συναριθμεῖται· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλότριον ἐπιμίγνυται τῇ Τριάδι ἀλλ' ἀδιάιρετός ἐστι, καὶ ὁμοία ἑαυτῇ. Ἀρκεῖ ταῦτα τοῖς πιστοῖς. ἕως τότου τὰ Χερουβὶμ καλύπτει τὰς πρόσωπα· Ὁ δὲ περιττὰ τούτων ζητῶν καὶ θέλων ἐρευνᾶν παρακούει τὸ λέγοντος, μὴ σοφίζου πολλὰ, &c. *Athanaſ. ep. ad Serapion. p. 357. Tom. 1.*

Εἰ δὲ πολλὰ ἀγνοεῖς, καὶ μυριοπλάσια τῶν ἐγνωσμένων ὅτι τὰ ἀγνοούμενα, τί καὶ μετὰ πάντων καὶ περὶ τὸ τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως τὸ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὴν ἀκατάληψιαν ἄγνοιαν ἀνεπαισχύντως ὁμολογεῖς; *Baſil. De Spir. Sancto. c. 18.*

Τίς οὖν ἡ ἐκπόρευσις; εἰπὲ σὺ τὴν ἀγεννησίαν τοῦ πατρὸς, κἀγὼ τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ υἱοῦ φυσιλογήσω, καὶ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ παρεπλήκτισμεν ἀμφω εἰς Θεοῦ μυστήρια παρακύψαντες. καὶ ταῦτα τίνες, οἱ μηδὲ τὰ ἐν ποσὶν εἰδέναι δυνάμενοι, &c. *Greg. Nazian. orat. 37. p. 597. Tom. 1.*

Εἰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς τὶ καταλείψεις τοῖς μόνοις γινώσκειν ἄλληλα καὶ γινώσκεσθαι ὑπ' ἀλλήλων μαρτυρουμένοις. *Orat. 23. Tom. 1. p. 426.*

Ὅτι μὲν ὅτι καὶ ὑπάρχει καὶ τῶν ὅλων κρατεῖ συναινῶν τε καὶ συντιθέμενος· ἐπέκεινα δὲ ὥσπερ τῶν τῆς ἀνθρωποτήτος μέτρων εἶναι τὸν σωφρονοῦντα ἐκφεύγει. *Cyril. Paſchal. 12. Tom. 5. p. 2.*

moſt of all, when they come to make diſtinctions between the *Generation* of the *Son*, and the *Proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, (of which no leſs than nine are recounted and rejected by *Petavius* out of the *Fathers* and *Schoolmen*, and the laſt which he reſts in, which is the common one of the *Schools*, *viz.* That the one is *per modum Intellectûs*, and the other *per modum Amoris*, as unſatisfactory as any, there being ſo vaſt a diſproportion between the moſt immediate acts of our ſouls and theſe emanations) will ſee much greater reaſon to commend the Wiſdome of thoſe Fathers, who ſought to repreſs mens curioſity as to theſe things, and as much to condemn you, who are ſo apt to charge whole *Churches* with Hereſie, if they come not up to every thing which you ſhall pronounce to be an *Article of Faith.*

Dogm. Theol. de Trinit. l. 7. c. 13, 14. Tom. 2.

§. 8. 2. It is plain from the Fathers, *That they made the belief of that to be ſufficient for ſalvation, which doth not imply this Proceſſion from the Son*; which is, that the *Holy Ghoſt* doth proceed from the *Father*: If therefore they often mention the *Proceſſion from the Father*, without taking notice of the *Proceſſion from the Son*, and when they do ſo, aſſert the ſufficiency of the belief of that for Salvation; there cannot be the leaſt ground to imagine that they looked on the Proceſſion from the *Son* as a neceſſary Article of Faith. We ſee before, *Athanaſius* made no more neceſſary, than the belief of the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and in the ſame diſcourſe, where he ſpeaks expreſly what the Orthodox opinion was of the *Holy Ghoſt*, he ſays no more, but, *If they thought well of the Word, they would likewiſe of the Spirit, which proceeds from the Father, and is proper to the Son, and is given by him to the Diſciples, and all that believe on him.* In which words there is nothing but what the *Greeks* to this day do moſt freely and heartily acknowledge, *viz.* *That the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father, and is the Spirit of the Son*, being given by him to all that believe. Many other Teſtimonies are produced out of him and the reſt of the *Greek Fathers*, by the *Patriarch Hieremias* in his Anſwer to the *Wirtenberg Divines*, by *Marcus Epheſius* in his Diſputes in the *Council* of *Florence*, by *Gregorius Palamas* in his Anſwer to *Beccus* the *Latinizing Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* in the time of *Michael Palæologus*, and other modern Defendants of the *Greek Church*. But although I do not think, that the places produced by them are ſufficient for their purpoſe, *viz.* *That theſe Fathers believed the Proceſſion from the Father, excluſivè*, to be an Article of Faith; yet whoſoever will take the pains to compare thoſe Teſtimonies with the others produced on the other ſide by thoſe who writ in defence of the *Filioque*, either *Latins*, as *Hugo Eterianus*, *Anſelme*, &c. or *Latinizing Greeks*, ſuch as *Nicephorus Blemmydes*, *Beccus*, *Emanuel Calecas* and others, will find it moſt for the honour of the Fathers, and moſt conſonant to Truth, to aſſert that they did not look upon this as any neceſſary Article of Faith, and therefore took liberty to expreſs themſelves differently about it as they ſaw occaſion. For ſuch different Teſtimonies are produced not only of different *Fathers*, but of ſeveral *places* of the ſame, that it will be a hard matter but upon this ground to reconcile them to each other and themſelves: And that which abundantly confirms it, is, That when they ſate moſt ſolemnly in *Council* to determine the matters of Faith about the *Trinity*, they were ſo far from inſerting this, when they had juſt occaſion to do it, that they only mention the Proceeding from the *Father*, and determine this to be a perfect *Symbol* of *Chriſtian Faith* which contained no more. In the *firſt Nicene Creed*, and that which is properly ſo called, (for that which now goes under that Name is the *Conſtantinopolitan*

Εἰ γὰρ ἐφρόνουν ὀρθῶς περὶ τὸ λόγε, ἐφρόνουν ἂν ὑγιῶς καὶ περὶ τὸ ἁγίε πνεύματος· ὁ παρὰ τῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ τῦ υἱῦ ἴδιον ὂν, παρ' αὐτῦ μεταδίδοται τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς πιςεύσιν εἰς αὐτόν. Athanaſ. c. Serapi. ubi ſupr.

Acta Theolog. Wirtenberg. p. 217. &c. Reſ. 2. Patriarch.
Concil. Florent. ſeſſ. 19, 20, 21, &c.
Arcudii opuſcula aurea.
V. ep. Cyrilli Patriarch. ad Joh. utenbogard. inter epiſtol. Remonſtrant. p. 402.

V. Leonis Allatii Græciam Orthodox. Tom. 2.

politan Creed) there was nothing at all determined concerning the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*; and yet *Athanaſius* ſaith expreſly of the Faith there delivered by the Fathers according to the Scriptures, *That it was of it ſelf ſufficient for the turning men from all impiety, and the eſtabliſhment of all Chriſtian Piety.* And afterwards ſaith, That *though certain men contended much for ſome additions to be made to it, yet the Sardican Synod would by no means conſent to it, becauſe the Nicene Creed was not defective, but ſufficient for Piety, and therefore forbid the making any new Creed, leſt the former ſhould be accounted defective.* We ſee then by the Teſtimony of *Athanaſius* and the *Sardican Synod*, (which when it ſerves your turn, as in the caſe of Appeals, you extol ſo much, and in defence of *Zozimus* his forgery of the *Nicene Canons* you would have confounded with the *Nicene*) that the *Nicene Creed* without any thing at all concerning the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt* was looked on as ſufficient to Salvation, and therefore certainly they did not then judge this Article of the *Proceſſion* to be ſo neceſſary as you would have it be. But ſuppoſe we yield *Nazianzen*, and the *Fathers* of the *Conſtantinopolitan Council*, that though this *Creed* was not defective as to the *Son*, yet there ought to be ſomewhat added further concerning the *Holy Ghoſt*, upon the riſing of *Macedonius*: yet even here we ſhall find when they purpoſely added to the Article of the *Holy Ghoſt*, they added only this touching the *Proceſſion* τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, *which proceedeth from the Father.* And thus the Copies of the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed*, either in the *Councils* or elſewhere have it, where they mention the Proceſſion at all; And when *Marcus Epheſius* in the *Florentine Council* read this *Creed*, the *Latins* took no exceptions at all to it, but it paſſed then as it doth ſtill for the *Nicene Creed* (although it much differs from the Original *Nicene*), and therefore it is a great miſtake of them who imagine the Article of *Filioque* was found in ſome Copies of this *Creed*, for this the *Latins* never pretended in the *Florentine Council*, (but did indeed as to the *Creed* of the ſecond *Council* of *Nice*, but were therein much ſuſpected of forgery by the *Greeks*) which might be the ground of that miſtake. But that which I inſiſt on is, If this Article of the Proceſſion of the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Son* had been by theſe *Fathers* judged neceſſary, when had there been a fitter time to inſert it, than now, when purpoſely they added the Proceſſion to the former Creed? And yet we ſee they did not judge it at all neceſſary to be inſerted. It may be you will ſay, it was, *Becauſe the Controverſie was not then ſtarted concerning the Filioque*: But that can ſignifie nothing here, becauſe we have already ſhewed that the *Fathers* themſelves ſpake differently concerning it, and looked upon it as a thing not neceſſary to be known; but the things which were upon the riſing of *Hereticks* inſerted into the *Creed*, were ſuch as by the *Fathers* were judged and believed as neceſſary before ever thoſe Hereticks aroſe; as in the Caſe here of *Macedonius*, for I hope you will not ſay it was no Hereſie to deny the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghoſt* till it was determined in this *Oecumenical Council*? For the *Fathers* never thought that they made Articles of Faith in *Councils*, but only declared themſelves and what they believed againſt the Hereticks which did ariſe in the *Church*: And therefore that anſwer of the *Filioque* not being then controverted comes to nothing. From hence we come to the third *Oecumenical Council*, to ſee if that adds any thing concerning this *Proceſſion*; inſtead of which it highly confirms what was eſtabliſhed before; for the *Fathers* of that *Council* diſcerning at laſt the great inconveniency of making ſuch additions to the *Creed*, becauſe the *Neſtorians* had got the art of it too, and made a new *Creed* of their own, (which by *Chariſius* was brought to the Council and there read)

Ἡ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων καὶ τὰς θείας γραφὰς ὁμολογηθεῖσα πίστις, αὐτάρκης ἦν πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν μὲν πάσης ἀσεβείας, σύστασιν δὲ εὐσεβείας ἐν Χριστῷ. Athanaſ. ep. ad Epict. Tom. 1. p. 562.

Greg. Nazian. Ep. 2. ad Cled.

read) upon which the *Epheſine Fathers* make an irrevocable decree *againſt all additions being made hereafter to the Creed.* For after they had cauſed the *Nicene*, or rather the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* to be publickly read (in which yet the Article of Proceſſion was left out, as appears by that Copy which *Marcus Epheſius* produced at the *Council of Ferrara*, as it is likewiſe in the Copies of the *Epheſine Council*) upon which they paſs this definitive Sentence; *That it ſhould not be lawful hereafter for any one to produce, write, or compoſe any other Creed, beſides that which was agreed on and deſigned by the Holy Fathers, who were met together at* Nice *by the Holy Spirit.* Concerning the meaning of this Decree, we ſhall fully enquire when we come to the addition of the *Filioque*. That which I take notice of it now for, is, not only the further ratification of what was in the *Creed* before, and that what was therein contained was as much as was judged neceſſary, but an expreſs Decree made againſt all after-additions; which doth, as fully as a *General Council* could do, declare that nothing elſe was neceſſary to be believed, but what was already inſerted in the Creed: or elſe, To what end did they prohibit any further additions? To the like purpoſe, the fourth *General Council* of *Chalcedon* determins, *That by no means they would ſuffer that Faith to be moved which was already defined.* I might proceed to the fifth and ſixth *Councils*, but theſe are ſufficient. Let me now put ſome few *Queſtions* to you, Are General Councils Infallible, or no? *Yes*, ſay you, *if confirmed by the Pope.* Were not theſe four firſt Councils confirmed? *Yes, it is evident they were.* Were they then Infallible in all their Decrees or no, eſpecially concerning matters of Faith? If they were, were they not Infallible in this Determination, That it ſhould not be lawful to add to the *Creed* any thing elſe but what was in before? were they Infallible in declaring the received *Creed* to be full and ſufficient? If they were ſo, how comes any Article to become neceſſary, which was not then in the *Creed?* If you ſay, The *Pope* and another *General Council* have power Infallibly to contradict theſe, and to ſay that ſomewhat elſe is neceſſary to be inſerted into the *Creed*, and to be believed in order to Salvation; I muſt content my ſelf with having brought you to the humble confeſſion, that both parts of a Contradiction may be Infallibly determined. Thus we ſee that the *Fathers*, whether ſingle or joyned, in ſuch *Councils* which are of the greateſt Authority in the Chriſtian world, have been ſo far from believing or determining this Article of the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt* to be neceſſary, (which muſt be, if the denial of it be a fundamental error) that they have plainly enough expreſſed and determined the contrary.

Concil. Epheſ. part. 2. Act. 6. p. 357. Tom. 2. Binii ed. Pari. 1636.

Concil. Florent. Seſſ. 5. p. 587.

Μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν, ἢγουν συγγράφειν, ἢ συνιθέναι ἑτέραν πίστιν, παρὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συναχθέντων ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. Concil. Eph. Part. 2. Act. 6. p. 366.

Κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον σαλεύεσθαι πρός τινων ἀνεχόμεθα τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν πίστιν. Concil. Chalced. Act. 5. Concil. Florent. Aſſ. 5. p. 590.

§. 9. 2. The next thing we come to, is, *That thoſe Teſtimonies which are produced out of the Fathers, are ſo far from aſſerting the neceſſity of this Article, that the moſt of them do not evidently prove that they believed it.* For theſe two Anſwers the *Greeks* return to them. 1. That they do not aſſert the Proceſſion of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, but the *conſubſtantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Son*. 2. That thoſe which ſpeak of a *Proceſſion* do not mean it of an *Eternal Proceſſion*, but a *Temporal*, which is the ſame with the *Spirits Miſſion*.

1. That they do not aſſert the *Eternal Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, but the *conſubſtantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Son*. And therefore no more can be inferred from them, but only the ὁμοούσιον which the *Greeks* conſtantly acknowledge. This they make probable by two things: 1. That, when the *Fathers* diſpute not with thoſe who denied the *conſubſtantiality* of *Son* and *Spirit*, they uſe not the Particle *ex*, but only ſay that the *Spirit* is the *Spirit* of the *Son*. So *Cyril* expreſly, when *Theodoret* had denied the Proceſſion

Proceſſion from the Son, he gives no other Anſwer, but this, *The Holy Spirit doth truly proceed from God and the Father, according to our Saviours words, but is not of another nature from the Son.* We ſee he contents himſelf with the acknowledgement that the Spirit is of the ſame nature with the Son: To the ſame purpoſe is another teſtimony of his produced by the *Patriarch Hieremias*; ſpeaking of the *Spirit* whereby the Apoſtles ſpake, he ſays, *Which proceeded in an ineffable manner from the Father, but is not different from the Son in regard of his eſſence.* Several other teſtimonies are there produced by him, and elſewhere by others which need not be here recited. 2. That when they uſe the particle *ex*, it is againſt thoſe who denied the *Conſubſtantiality* both of the *Son* and *Spirit*; and therefore *Gregorius Palamas* lays down this Rule, *That, as often as the præpoſitions,* ex *and* per, *have the ſame force in Divinity; they do not denote any diviſion or difference in the Trinity, but only their conjunction and inſeparable union, and conſent of their wills.* For which, he cites the famous Epiſtle of *Maximus* to *Marinus* which was made the foundation of the *Union* at the *Council* of *Florence*, who therein ſaith, that when the *Latins* ſaid in their *Synodical Epiſtle*, ſent to *Conſtantinople*, that the *Spirit* did proceed ex *filio*, they meant no more than to ſhew τὸ συναφὲς τῆς οὐσίας καὶ ἀπαραλλάκτου, *the perfect and inſeparable Union of the Divine Eſſence.* So when S. *Baſil* ſaith, that the *Father did create the world, per filium*; he adds, that notes no more than τὸ ἡνωμένον τῷ θελήματι, *the conjunction of their Wills.* And by this means the *Greeks* interpret all thoſe paſſages of the *Fathers*, which ſeem moſt expreſs for the *Spirits proceeding ex filio.* So *Marcus Epheſius* tells the *Latins* in the *Florentine Council*, that when we ſay, Man comes ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας, *from the Eſſence of a man*, therein is not implied, that the Eſſence of man is the productive cauſe of man, but only it notes the τὸ ὁμούσιον, *that Communion of Eſſence* which is in men; ſo, when the *Greek Fathers* ſpeak of the *Spirit's proceeding ex Filio*, that doth not imply that the *Son* is the Principle of *Spiration*, but that there is a *Communion of Eſſence* between the *Son* and the *Spirit*. So, when *Athanaſius* diſputing againſt the *Arrians* (ſaith the Patriarch *Hieremias*) ſaith, that the Spirit ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ *from the Son, is given to all*; and *that the Father* διὰ τοῦ λόγου, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, *by the Son, in the Spirit, doth create, work, and give all things*; you muſt conſider, that *Athanaſius* was then diſputing againſt the *Arrians*, who made both *Son* and *Spirit* to be *creatures*: that therefore he might ſhew that the *Spirit* was of the ſame *Subſtance* with the *Father* and the *Son*; he therefore uſeth that prepoſition *ex*, ἐγκαίρως καὶ ἁρμοδίως *very opportunely and conveniently.* Therefore, ſaith he, *It is to be obſerved, that he never uſeth this but in oppoſition to the* Arrians, *and ſuch who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt.* To which purpoſe it is well obſerved by *Spalatenſis*, that when the *Fathers* of the *Conſtantinopolitan Council* did inſert into their *Creed* the Article of the *Spirits Proceſſion* from the *Father*; they did it not with a purpoſe to define any thing concerning the *Proceſſion* as an Article of *Faith*, but that they might from thoſe words of S. *John* infer the *Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt*, becauſe it proceeds from the *Father*: And withal, it is further obſervable, that in the *Creed*, which *Chariſius* delivered into, and was accepted by, the *Council* of *Epheſus*, all that he ſays as to the *Holy Ghoſt*, is, *And in the Spirit of Truth, the Paraclete who is conſubſtantial with the Father and the Son.* By which, that which *Spalatenſis* ſaith is much confirmed; for this Symbol of *Chariſius* was accepted by the *Council* as agreeable to the *Nicene Creed.*

Ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κατὰ τὰ σωτήρια φωνὰς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀλλοτριόν ὅτι τοῦ υἱοῦ. Cyril. Alexan. Tom. 6. edit. Pariſ. p. 229.

Ὁ προέρχεται μὲν ἀῤῥήτως ἐκ τοῦ πατρός· ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον, κατὰ τὴν θείαν λόγον. Acta Theolog. Wittenberg. Reſp. 2. Patriarch. p. 202.

Gregorius Palamas, c. 1. apud Petavium Dogmat. Theolog. de Trin. To. 2. l. 7. c. 18. ἃ δὲ διαίρεσιν καὶ διάστασιν ἀλλὰ ἕνωσιν, καὶ τὴν ἀπαραλλαξίαν —— καὶ ὁμοβουλίαν.

Seſſ. 19.

ubi ſupra.

Spalatenſ. de Rep. Eccleſ. Tom. 3. l. 7. c. 10. ſect. 129.

Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀληθείας, τὸ παράκλητον ὁμούσιον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ. Apud Acta Concil. Epheſ. part. 2. Act. 6. p. 360.

Creed. Thus we ſee, how probable this Anſwer of the *Greeks* is, That the intention of the *Fathers* in thoſe expreſſions is only to aſſert the *conſubſtantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Father* and the *Son*, becauſe when they uſed them it was in their diſputes with them who denied it. And therefore *Petavius* ſpends his pains to very little purpoſe; when going about to take off this anſwer of the *Greeks*, he only ſhews that thoſe expreſſions *in themſelves* cannot be confined meerly to the ſignification of the *Conſubſtantiality* of the perſons, whereas the main force of this anſwer lies in the intention and ſcope of the perſons who uſed them, and the adverſaries they diſputed againſt, and not in the importance of the Articles themſelves.

Petavi. ubi ſupra.

2. The ſecond anſwer of the *Greeks*, is, that moſt of thoſe places which ſpeak of the Proceſſion of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, are not to be underſtood of the *Eternal Proceſſion*, but of the *Temporal*, which is the ſame with the *Spirits Miſſion*. This, as the reſt of the *Greeks*, ſo the *Patriarchs Hieremias* and *Cyril* eſpecially inſiſt upon; the firſt in his laſt anſwer to the *Divines* of *Wirtenberg*. For when they in their reply to his ſecond anſwer, had produced ſeveral teſtimonies of *Athanaſius*, *Cyril*, *Epiphanius*, *Baſil*, and *Nazianzen*, in behalf of the *Spirits Proceſſion* from the *Son*; he wonders at them, that leaving the plain and clear places both of *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, which do (as he ſaith) ſo openly proclaim the *Spirits Proceſſion from the Father only*, they ſhould hope for relief from other obſcure places, which are capable of a different interpretation. As from the word πεμπειν, which only relates to the *Spirits manifeſtation*, and is quite different from the ἐκπόρευσις, and ſo cannot imply his Eternal Proceſſion. Therefore for the clearing the controverſie, and giving account of the miſtakes in it, he begins with the ſignification of the *Spirit*, which when it is applied to the *Divine Spirit*, is capable of different ſignifications, being taken either for the ſeveral gifts of the Spirit, or for the perſon of the Spirit; and ſo, though the word Proceſſion be taken in a peculiar manner for the Eternal Proceſſion of the Spirit, yet it is not only ſometimes attributed to the beſtowing the forementioned gifts, but likewiſe to the Eternal *Generation* of the *Son*; and therefore whenever they meet with the word Proceſſion attributed to the Spirit with a reſpect to the *Son*, they muſt not preſently infer the Eternal Proceſſion, but the word ἐκπορεύεσθαι there ſignifies no more than δύναι, πέμπεσθαι, καὶ δίδοσθαι, *i. e.* that the *Spirit doth come through, is ſent, and given by the Son*, which the *Fathers* often mention, the better thereby to aſſert τὴν συμφυΐαν καὶ γνησιότητα τοῦ πνεύματος, *the Identity of nature and eſſence, which is in the Spirit with the Father and Son.* This he doth therein very largely explain, and endeavour to make it out, that this is the moſt proper interpretation both of Scripture and Fathers, when they ſeem moſt clearly to ſpeak of the Proceſſion of the *Spirit* from the *Son*. The ſame likewiſe the *Patriarch Cyril* inſiſts upon, who acknowledgeth theſe ſeveral words to be attributed to the *Spirit* in reference to the *Son* δίδοσθαι, πεμπεσθαι, ἐκπεμπεσθαι, ἐκπυτεῖσθαι, πεμπειν, and ſeveral others in the writings of the *Fathers*, all which he acknowledgeth to be true, but he denies that any of them do import a *Hypoſtatical Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, but that they all refer to the temporal miſſion and manifeſtation of the *Spirit* through *Chriſt*, under the *Goſpel*. Whether this anſwer will reach to all the places produced out of the *Fathers*, is not here my buſineſs to enquire, only that which is pertinent to my purpoſe may be ſufficiently inferred from hence, that the *Fathers* certainly were not *deſinitive* in this *Controverſie*, when their expreſſeſt ſentences ſeem capable of quite a different meaning to wiſe and learned men, who, one would think, if the belief of this Proceſſion had been a tradition of their Church, or fully expreſſed in the Writings of the *Fathers* of the *Greek Church*, could

Acta Theolog. Wirtenb. p. 350, &c. Reſp. 3. Patriarch.

Cyril. ep. ad Wtenbogard. p. 403.

could not be ſo ignorant or wilful as either not to ſee this to have been their meaning, or ſuppoſing they had ſeen it, to perſiſt in ſo obſtinate a belief of the contrary. I can therefore with advantage return your words back again to you. *It is to be conſidered, that for many hundred years the whole Greek Church never believed this to be an Article of Faith; nay the Fathers were ſo far from it, that both ſingle and in general Councils they did plainly expreſs the contrary; how then bears it any ſhew of probability, what ſome few of yeſterday (forced to it by an impoſſibility of otherwiſe defending the power and Infallibility of the* Roman *Church) affirm, that the matter of this Controverſie is ſo great and conſiderable, that it is ſufficient to produce an Hereſie on either ſide? Is not this to make Fathers, and General Councils, and conſequently all Chriſtendom for many hundred years, quite blind, and themſelves only clear and ſharp-ſighted? Which ſwelling preſumption, what ſpirit it argues, and whence it proceeds, all thoſe who have learnt from reaſon, if not from* S. Auguſtine, *That pride is the Mother of making Hereſies in unneceſſary Articles of Faith, will eaſily collect.* Do not you ſee now, how unadviſedly thoſe words came from you, which with ſo ſmall variation in the manner of expreſſion, and much greater truth in the matter of it, are returned upon your ſelf?

§. 10. But I go on ſtill, if poſſible, to make you ſenſible, how much you have wronged the *Greek Church* in this charge of a fundamental errour in her for denying the *Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* from the *Son*. Which ſhall be from hence, that although there were ſome who did as plainly deny this as ever the *Modern Greeks did or do*, yet they were far from being condemned for *Hereſie* in ſo doing. For which we muſt conſider, that although the *Fathers*, as we have already ſeen, did ſpeak ambiguouſly in this matter, yet the firſt who appears openly and ſtoutly to have denied it, was *Theodoret*; which, being the riſe of the *Controverſie*, muſt be more carefully enquired into. It appears then, that a *General Council* being ſummoned by the *Emperour Theodoſius* to meet at *Epheſus* concerning the opinions of *Neſtorius* which were vehemently oppoſed by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and ſeveral *Ægyptian* and *Aſian Biſhops*, who being there convened, proceed to the *depoſition* of *Neſtorius* and *Anathematizing* his doctrine, before *Johannes Antiochenus*, and ſeveral other *Biſhops* who favoured *Neſtorius*, were come to *Epheſus*. When theſe therefore came and found what had been done by the other *Biſhops*, they being ſeconded by *Candidianus* there and the *Court-party* at *Conſtantinople*, aſſemble apart by themſelves, and proceed on the other ſide to a depoſition and excommunication of *Cyril* and *Memnon*, who were the leaders of all the reſt; and theſe make an *Anti-Synod* to the other, which conſiſted of perſons of ſeveral intereſts and perſwaſions, ſome *Pelagians*, ſome *Neſtorians*, and others, more as *Friends* to *Neſtorius* than his opinions, as being his *Ancient Familiars* and acquaintance, did joyn with them to prevent his depoſition; among which, the chief were *Johannes Antiochenus*, and *Theodoret*. But, before the *Council*, *Cyril* had publiſhed his twelve *Anathema's* againſt the opinions of *Neſtorius*: to theſe therefore, not only the *Oriental Biſhops* gave an anſwer, but *John* the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* particularly appoints *Theodoret* to refute them. The *ninth Anathema* of *Cyril* was againſt *Neſtorius*, and all others who ſaid, *That Chriſt uſed the Holy Ghoſt as a diſtinct power from himſelf, for the working of miracles, and that did not acknowledge him to be the proper Spirit of Chriſt*. *Theodoret* grants the firſt part, wherein he ſhews he was no *Neſtorian*, but quarrels with the latter part; for ſaith he, *If by that he means that the Spirit is of the ſame nature with the Son, and that it proceeds from the Father, we acknowledge it together with him —— but if by that he underſtands as though the Spirit had his ſubſiſtence from or by the Son, we reject it as blaſphemous and impious*. Was ever anything in this kind ſpoken with greater heat

Ἴδιον δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ, εἰ μὲν ὡς ὁμοφυὲς καὶ ὁμοπαθὲς ἐκπορευόμενον ἔστι, συνομολογήσομεν, —— εἰ δὲ ὡς ἐξ υἱοῦ, ἢ δι' υἱοῦ τοῦ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ ἔχον, ὡς βλάσφημον τοῦτο, καὶ ὡς δυσσεβὲς ἀποῤῥίπτομεν. Theodret. c. Cyril. Anath Tom. 4. p. 718. ed. Sirmond. Concil. Epheſ. part. 3. p. 497. ed. Bin.

and confidene than this was here by *Theodoret*? And if this had been looked on as *Heretical* at that time, can we possibly imagine that so zealous an
Cyril. Tom. 6. p. 229. opposer of all Heresies, and especially of the *Nestorians*, as S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* was, should so coolly and patiently pass this by as he doth? For all the answer he gives, is only that which was before cited out of him; that he acknowledgeth *The Spirit doth proceed from the Father, but yet* οὐκ ἀλλότριόν ἐστι τοῦ υἱοῦ, *it is not of another nature from the Son*; but did not *Theodoret* expressly assert that, as well as *Cyril*? Is it then possible that any one who hath his wits about him, should imagine, that if that doctrine of *Theodoret* had been accounted *Heretical*, it being expressed in so vehement a manner as it is, it should have no other answer from *Cyril*, but only approving that which *Theodoret* confesseth, *viz. the Consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Son*? All
Dogmat. Theol. To. 2. l. 7. c. 18. the answer which *Petavius* and others give, is so weak and trifling, that one may easily see how much they were put to it to find out any: Sometimes it
c. 1. was because *Cyril* was intent upon his business, and therefore passed it by; as though he were so weak a man as to let his adversary broach Heresie and say nothing to it, because it was not pertinent to the present cause. But if it were not, it is an argument the second *Answer* is false, *viz.* that *Theodoret* was herein a *Nestorian*; for if he were so, it could not be besides the business, but was a main part of it. Moreover, if this were a piece of *Nestorianism*, it is very strange the *Fathers* of that *Council*, when they purposely collected the opinions of *Nestorius* out of his own Writings, should never make any mention
Concil. Ephes. Part. 2. Act. 1. p. 177. at all of this, no not when they produce his opinion concerning the *Spirit of God*. Why was it not then condemned and *Anathematized* as one of his Heresies? why did not the *Oriental Bishops*, when they subscribed to the deposition of *Nestorius*, and the election of *Maximianus* at *Constantinople*, and sent a Confession of their Faith to *Cyril* at *Alexandria* by *Paulus Emesenus*, mention this among the rest of their agreement with the Orthodox *Bishops*?
Part. 3. p. 536. Yet in that extant both in *Cyril*'s works, and in the third part of the Council at *Ephesus*, there is not the least intimation of it. And therefore the learned *Jesuit Sirmondus* in the life of *Theodoret* prefixed by him to the first *Tome* of his works which he set forth, vindicates *Theodoret* from all suspicion of *Nestorianism*, and imputes all the troubles which he fell into on that account to the violence of *Dioscorus* the successor of *Cyril* at *Alexandria*, who being a great Patron of the *Eutychians* thought to revenge himself on *Theodoret* by blasting his reputation as a *Nestorian*. There is not then any shew of probability that this opinion in *Theodoret* was condemned as a piece of *Nestorianism*, which certainly the whole *Greek Church* could not have been ignorant of, from that time to this But though that piece of *Theodoret* against *Cyrils Anathema*'s were condemned in succeeding *Councils*, yet that might be for the defence of other things, which they judged bordered too near on *Nestorianism*, or because they would not have any monument remain of that discord between the *Oriental Bishops*,
Part. 3. p. 561. and the *Ephesine Council*; which *Theodosius* doth so much and so heartily lament in his excellent Epistle to *Johannes Antiochenus* about a reconciliation between him and *Cyril*, after the banishment of *Nestorius*, and the choice of *Maximianus*. Thus we see one who in a divided and busie time ventured upon the absolute denial of the Procession of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son* not as a bare errour, but as *impious and blasphemous*, yet was far from being condemned for Heretical himself for saying so, by those *Fathers*, who were the most zealous defenders of the true *Apostolical Faith*. And if these things considered together, do not make it appear that the *Fathers* did not make the denial of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son to be a Heresie, I know not what can be made plain from them.

§. 11. But I know, whatever the *Fathers* say, you are of *Cornelius Mussus* his mind,

mind, who heartily profeſſed, *that he preferred the judgement of one Pope, before a thouſand Auguſtines* and *Hieroms*; but what if the *Popes* ſhould prove of the ſame mind with the *Fathers*, how then can this be accounted an Hereſie? And that they were exactly of the ſame mind, might be made appear by the ſeveral Epiſtles of *Vigilius* and *Agatho* in confirmation of the Faith eſtabliſhed in the *four firſt General Councils*, in which it was determined, that all neceſſaries were already in the *Creed*, and that there needed no further additions to it, both which are produced and inſiſted on by the *Greeks* in the fifth *Seſſion* at *Ferrara*. But I paſs by them, and come to more particular teſtimonies of *Popes*, and that either in *Councils*, or upon a reference to them from *Councils*. The firſt time we read of this Controverſie in the *Weſtern Churches* was about *Anno Dom.* 767. in the time of *Conſtantinus Copronymus*, upon which in the time of *Pepin* King of *France*, there was a *Synod* held at *Gentilly* near *Paris* for determining a *Controverſie* between the *Greeks* and *Latins* about the *Trinity*, as appears by the ſeveral teſtimonies of *Ado* and *Rhegino* in their *Chronicles*, produced by *Pithæus*, *Petavius*, and others: but little more is left of that Convention, beſides the bare mention of it; but it ſeems the aſhes were only raked over theſe coals then, which about two and forty years after, *Anno Dom.* 809. broke out into a greater *flame*; for as appears by the *teſtimonies* of the ſame *Ado*, and *Adelmus* or *Ademarus*, a *Synod* was held at *Aquiſgrane*, about this very queſtion, *Whether the Spirit did proceed from the Son as well as the Father*; which queſtion, they ſay, was ſtarted by one *John* a *Monk* of *Jeruſalem*, which *Monk Pithæus* ſuppoſeth to be *Johannes Damaſcenus*, who after *Theodoret* moſt expreſly denied *the Proceſſion from the Son*; but whether it was he or any other, it ſeems from that *Council* called by *Charles* the *Great*, there were ſeveral *Legats* (called *Apocriſiarii*) diſpatched to *Rome* to know the judgement of the preſent *Pope Leo* 3. concerning this Controverſie; the *Legats* were *Bernarius*, *Jeſſe*, and *Adalhardus*, the two former the *Biſhops* of *Worms* and *Amiens*, the latter the *Abbot* of *Corbey*. But *Petavius* herein betrays either his *fraud* or *inadvertency*, that he will by no means admit that theſe came to the *Pope* to know his judgement concerning the *Proceſſion it ſelf*, but only concerning the *Addition* of the *Filioque* to the *Creed*, which now began to be uſed in the *Gallican Churches* with that *Addition*. But although I grant that the main of their buſineſs was concerning the *Addition* of *Filioque*, by the ſame token that *Leo* condemned it, as will appear afterwards; yet that brought on the diſcourſe concerning the Doctrine it ſelf of the *Proceſſion* from the *Son*. For in the *Acts* of *Smaragdus* which were ſent to *Charles* the *Great*, giving an account of this Controverſie, which are publiſhed both by *Baronius*, and *Sirmondus*; it appears that when they urge the *Pope* for his conſent to the addition of *Filioque*, they make uſe of this Argument, That it was a matter of Faith, and therefore none ſhould be ignorant of it; upon which they ask the *Pope* this Queſtion; *Whether if any one doth not know or doth not believe this Article, he could be ſaved?* To which the *Pope* returns this wiſe and cautious Anſwer. *Whoſoever by the ſubtilty of his wit can reach to the knowledge of it, and knowing it, will not believe it, he cannot be ſaved. For there are many things, of which this is one, which being the deeper myſteries of Faith, to the knowledge of them many can attain, but many others cannot, being hindred either through want of age, or capacity; and therefore, as we ſaid before, he that can and will not, ſhall not be ſaved.* I pray, Sir, do me the Favour to let me know your judgement, whether this *Pope* were infallible or no? or, will you acknowledge that he was quite *beſide the*

Concil. Florent. ſeſſ. 5. p. 593.

Pithæus Opuſ. de proceſ. S. S. p. 26. Petav. Dogm. Theol. To. 2. l. 7. c. 1.

Baron. Annal. ad An. 809. Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. To. 2. p. 256, 257.

Quiſquis ad hoc ſenſu ſubtiliori pertingere poteſt, & id ſcire, aut ita ſciens, credere noluerit, ſalvus eſſe non poterit. Sunt enim multa, è quibus iſtud unum eſt, ſacræ fidei altiora myſteria, ad quorum indagationem pertingere multi valent: multi vero aut ætatis quantitate, aut intelligentiæ qualitate præpediti non valent; & ideo, ut prædiximus, qui potuerit, & noluerit, ſalvus eſſe non poterit. Apud Sirmond. ubi ſupra.

Cuſhion, that is, not *in Cathedrâ* when he ſpake it? What? not then, when Solemn *Legats* were diſpatched from a *Council* purpoſely to know his judgement in a matter of Controverſie, which the Church was divided about? If ſo, the *Pope* ſhall never be *in Cathedrâ* but when you will have him; or if he were there, you will ſurely ſay, he did not act very Apoſtolically, when he ſpake theſe words. For, can any thing be more plain, than that the *Pope* determins this Article of the *Proceſſion* from the *Son*, to be no neceſſary Article of Faith: but acknowledgeth it to be one of the deeper *myſteries* of *Religion* which none were obliged to believe, but ſuch as could reach to the knowledge of; which either want of age in ſome, capacity in others, and invincible prejudice in many more, might keep them from the knowledge of? Thus it appears by the *Popes* judgement, the denial of this could be no Hereſie then, becauſe he declares it, not to be neceſſary to be believed by all. What now muſt we think of this *Pope*, if we apply your words to him? *Were all other ſucceeding ages blind, and this Pope only clear and ſharp-ſighted? which judgement of his muſt be called nothing ſhort of ſwelling preſumption*; and if you pleaſe S. *Auſtin ſhall be quoted for it too*, but it muſt be in ſome other place, beſides that where he ſays, that *Pride is the mother of Hereſie*. Do you think we can do other than hugely applaud our ſelves, in ſeeing you ſo furiouſly lay about you, when we know, your firſt *blows* fall on the *Fathers*, and your ſecond cut off one *Leg* at leaſt of your *Infallible Chair*. Can we have better ſecurity againſt you than the judgement of one of your own *Popes?* may we not well be accounted blind, when for our ſakes *Infallibility* it ſelf muſt be ſo to? If you tell us that after-*Popes* declared otherwiſe: I have but one requeſt to make to you, *viz.* To make it appear, that when two *Popes* ſhall determine both parts of a *Contradiction to be true*, they both are *Infallible* in doing ſo.

§. 12. But if we proceed a little further, it may be we ſhall find the judgement of another *Pope* agreeing with this. For which we muſt conſider that *Anno Dom.* 858. *Ignatius* the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* being impriſoned by the *Emperour Michael*, and *Photius* being placed in his room, in a *Council* held by *Photius*, *Anno Dom.* 861. *Ignatius* was condemned, upon which he being likewiſe condemned by *Pope Nicolaus* at *Rome*, he doth as much for him at *Conſtantinople*. So that thoſe grudges which had been before more cloſely carred between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, did now openly diſcover themſelves. But among ſeveral other things which *Photius* charged the *Latin Church* with, the chiefeſt and that which he inſiſts on with the greateſt vehemency is, *That they did attempt to corrupt and adulterate the holy and ſacred Symbol of Faith, which had obtained an unalterable force by the Decrees of Synods and Councils, with falſe ſenſes and new additions, by an unmeaſurable confidence. O their Diabolical machinations! for by a ſtrange innovation, they make the Holy Ghoſt proceed not only from the Father, but the Son too.* This we find in his *Encyclical Epiſtle*, publiſhed by him on the account of the difference between the *Latin* and the *Greek Church*, in which he largely diſputes againſt the Doctrine of the *Proceſſion of the Spirit from the Son*, and, as we ſee, charges the *Latins* with fraud, preſumption, and a deſire of Innovation, in the inſerting that Article into the *Creed*. Not long after, this *Pope Nicolaus* having adviſed with the *Gallican Biſhops* what to do in this buſineſs, *dyes*; to whom *Adrian* ſucceeds as bitter againſt *Photius* as his Predeceſſor, and had more advantage againſt him than the other had. For, at *Conſtantinople* the *Emperour Michael* being ſlain by *Baſilius* whom he had adopted to a Partnerſhip in the *Empire* the year before, he preſently baniſheth *Photius*, reſtoreth *Ignatius*,

Καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἅγιον Σύμβολον, ὃ πᾶσι τοῖς Συνοδικοῖς καὶ οἰκουμενικοῖς Ψηφίσμασιν, ἄμαχον ἔχει τὴν ἰσχὺν, νόθοις λογισμοῖς, καὶ παρεγγράπτοις λόγοις, καὶ δράσας ὑπερβολῇ καινοτομεῖν ἐπεχείρησαν· ὢ τῆς πονηρᾶς μηχανημάτων! τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ καὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλά γε καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἐκπορεύεσθαι, καινολογήσαντες. Photius ep. 7. p. 51.

natius, calleth a *Council A. D.* 869. in which *Photius* is *Anathematized*; and, for the greater execration of him, they dipt their Pens wherewith they ſubſcribed, in the ſacred *Chalice*. This the *Latins* call the eighth *Oecumenical Synod*. Notwithſtanding all which, *Ignatius* being dead, *Photius* is reſtored by *Baſilius Macedo*, *Anno Dom.* 878. *Legats* are diſpatched to *Pope John* 8. (as in courteſie to you we call him) who ſucceeded *Adrian*, that *Photius* might be reſtored to the Communion of the *Church* and his *Patriarchal dignity*; which is preſently done. The year following, a *General Council* is held at *Conſtantinople*, in which the *Popes Legats* are preſent, and this the *Greeks* only admit for the eighth *Oecumenical*. In which all that was done againſt *Photius* is abrogated, the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* without the addition of *Filioque* is ſolemnly read, and it is decreed againſt the *Latins*, the *Popes Legats* conſenting, that nothing ſhould be added to the *Creed*. But leſt you ſhould think the *Popes Legats* were practiſed upon by ſome arts of *Photius* (for ſome of his Enemies among other reproaches, did not ſtick to ſay, he learnt *Magick* from the famous *Santarabenus*) and that it was done without the *Popes* free conſent: we have his own teſtimony afterwards in approbation of it. For *Pithæus*, an ingenuous as well as very learned man, confeſſeth, that the Letters of this *Pope* are ſtill extant among the *Latins*, by which it appears that he condemned all the *Synods* held againſt *Photius*, whether at *Rome* or *Conſtantinople*; and the *Patriarch Hieremias* (whoſe teſtimony in other caſes you make much of) ſaith expreſly, not only that the *Pope* conſented to this *Synod*, by the *Cardinal Peter*, and *Paulus*, and *Eugenius* who were there his *Legats*; but that in an Epiſtle he writ to *Photius*, he hath theſe words. *I declare again to your Grace, concerning that Article, by which ſuch ſcandals have been in the Churches of Chriſt. Aſſure your ſelf, that we not only ſpeak this, but that we really judge, Thoſe who firſt durſt out of their preſumption do this, to be tranſgreſſors of the ſacred Oracles, changers of the Doctrine of our Lord Chriſt, and the Holy Fathers, and we place them in the Society of* Judas. What Article was this, I pray, which the *Pope* is ſo zealous againſt? even no other than that *which you account all blind who do not eſteem the denial of it Hereſie*. It ſeems then we have one more added to the number of the Heretical *Popes*; for, *Photius* himſelf could not expreſs more vehemency againſt this Article than the *Pope* doth, and that when by his *Legats* in a *Council* (therefore *Infallible*, according to you, becauſe confirmed by the *Pope*) he had declared himſelf utterly againſt the addition of this *Article* to the *Creed*. And inſtead of accounting them Hereticks who denied it, you ſee how much worſe than *Hereticks* he accounted them who firſt added it. So that I wonder, you do not rather account the belief of that Article *Hereſie*, than the denial of it. I know well enough, how your party rail here to purpoſe againſt *Photius*; but what is all that to the buſineſs? Let *Photius* be what he will, Were not the *Popes Legats* preſent at the *Council*? Did not they confirm the decrees of it? Did not the *Pope* afterwards ratifie it? So that if ever Council were Infallible according to your Principles, this muſt be; chooſe therefore, either to relinquiſh the *Pope*'s and *Councils Infallibility*, or elſe acknowledge that men at one time may be infallibly guilty of violating *Scriptures*, *Fathers*, *Councils* for aſſerting that *Doctrine*, which they may be Infallibly guilty of *Hereſie* for not aſſerting at another. I know very well, that *Marinus* who ſucceeded *John* 8. at *Rome*, condemned his Predeceſſors acts and *Photius* together, (for he was before imployed both by *Nicolaus* and *Adrian* in the excommunicating and condemning *Photius*) but what this proves I underſtand

Opuſcul. edit. Lutet. 1609.

Πάλιν παραδηλῶμαι τῇσῃ αἰδεσιότητι, περὶ τῦ ἄρθρυ τύτυ, δι' ὃ συνίβη τὰ σκάνδαλα μέσον τῆ ἐκκλησιῶν τῦ χρισῦ· ἔχε πρὸς ἡμᾶς πληροφορίαν, ὅτι ὐ μόνον λέγομῳ τῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ πῶ πρώτυς διαῤῥήσαντας τῇ ἑαυτῶν ἀπονοία τῦτο ποιῆσαι, παραβάτας κρίνομεν τῆ θέων λόγων, καὶ μεταποιᾶς τῆ θεολογίας τῦ δεσπότυ χρισῦ, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων καὶ ὧν τὰ ἴχνη αὐτῶν τάπομῳ. Acta Theolog. Wirtenberg. Reſp. 2. Patriarch. p. 213, 214.

ſtand not, any further, than that ſtill one *Pope* may Infallibly contradict another, or that a *Pope* without a *Council* ſhall be more Infallible than with one, or laſtly (which is the grand *Arcanum Imperii*) thoſe *Popes* and thoſe Decrees which are for the preſent intereſt of the *Church* of *Rome* muſt be owned as Infallible; but for the reſt, the beſt Art muſt be uſed to blaſt them that may be. And for this you want not your many tricks and devices to accuſe Authors of Forgery, cry out on them for Hereticks, rail out of meaſure when you have nothing elſe to ſay; or if after all this, Teſtimonies ſtand of force againſt you, then nothing is left, but *Excogitato commento detorquere in alium ſenſum*, to find out ſome trick to wreſt them to another ſenſe, as the Authors of the *Belgick Index Expurgatorius* profeſſed in the caſe of *Bertram*. But for all men who think it not lawful to ſay any thing in a bad Cauſe, this may certainly be ſufficient to ſhew, that if *Fathers* and *Councils* may be relyed on, if *Popes* and *Councils* be Infallible, that was not accounted an Hereſie by them, which you condemn for ſuch in the *Greek Church*.

§. 13. Having thus diſcovered, that this opinion you condemn for *Hereſie* in the *Greek Church*, was otherwiſe eſteemed both by *Fathers*, *Oecumenical Councils*, *and Popes*; I come to that which you ſeem to rely on for making it Heretical, *viz. That the Greeks and Latins both together condemned it for Heretical in the* General Council *at* Florence. Although it might be worth our while to inquire how far any *General Council* can either make or declare that to be a neceſſary Article of Faith, which was determined to be otherwiſe by former *General Councils*. But omitting that at preſent which we may have a fitter occaſion to diſcuſs in the queſtion of *fundamentals*, and the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*; I therefore come to examine the matter of fact in the *Florentine Council*, concerning the determination of this opinion there as *Heretical*. Wherein if we conſider the time in which, and the occaſion upon which this *Council* was call'd, if we conſider the way of the managery of it, the *Arts* whereby the *Greeks* were drawn to this conſent, the manner of propoſing the *Decrees* of it, or the acceptance which it found in the *Greek Church*, upon none of theſe reſpects we ſhall have cauſe to look upon it as a *free* and *General Council*, determining that opinion as *Heretical*, which you ſay was ſo determined here. In all which we muſt profeſs how much we are obliged to that faithful and impartial account of all the proceedings relating to this *Council*, written by *Sylveſter Sguropulus* one preſent at the moſt ſecret negotiations of it, tranſcribed out of the *MS.* in the *King* of *France* his *Library*, by *Claudius Serravius*, and firſt publiſhed for the general good of the world by our learned *Dean of Wells*. It appears then, that which gave the firſt riſe to the thoughts of union between the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*, was the miſerable condition which the *Greek Empire* was now reduced to, by the incurſions of the *Turks* and *Saracens*. For it ſeems for thirty years, (before that an *Embaſſadour* was ſent to *Rome* from *Manuel Palæologus* to negotiate the buſineſs of the union) from the time of the *Patriarch Nilus* and *Pope Urban*, there had been no entercourſe at all between the *Popes* and *Patriarchs*, but now upon this addreſs made to them by the *Greeks*, the Popes careſs them with all imaginable kindneſs, feed them high with Promiſes, engage their utmoſt to promote this union, (well knowing with what advantage to themſelves it might be managed in this *Critical* juncture of their affairs). For now *Amurath* 2. having ſubdued *Peloponneſus*, had advanced almoſt to the walls of *Conſtantinople*, and therefore when the *Pope* ſent one to the *Emperour* and *Patriarch* to appoint a day for the *Council*, they told him they could not then have leiſure to think of *Councils*; and if they had, by reaſon of the fury of the Wars the *Biſhops* could not be aſſembled together to make a full *Council*.

Sylveſter Sguropul. Hiſtor. Concil. Florent. ſect. 2. c. 10.

But

But it ſeems the ſtate of affairs grew worſe ſtill with them, and the *Dead-Palſie* of *Manuel Palæologus* was but an *Emblem* of a *worſe* in the *State*, the *Empire* being brought daily into greater dangers. Which put *Johannes Paleologus* upon further thoughts, how any help or relief might be had from the *Weſt* in this extremity. But they might eaſily underſtand the terms of that *Union* from the Speech of the *Cardinals* to the *Emperours Legats*, That the *Roman Church* was the *Mother*, and the *Eaſtern* only the *Daughter*, and therefore it was but fit that the *Daughter* ſhould ſubmit to the *Mother*; That for their parts, they would not leave the deciſion of this Controverſie to multitudes of voices, (it ſeems then they had high thoughts of the Infallibility of *General Councils*,) but three ſhould be choſen on either ſide, who being apart by themſelves ſhould invoke *God*, and whatever he ſhould reveal to them, that all ſhould conſent to: For he that hath ſaid, that *Where two or three are gathered together in his Name he would be in the midſt of them; he that made the Aſs to ſpeak* (the Cardinal's own Argument) *would not fail of letting them know his Will Infallibly, which was to be received from them by all others.* (There may be then a much readier way for Infallibility, than by *Pope* and *Councils*). But if nothing elſe would ſatisfie but a *Council*, it muſt be in *Italy*, contrary to the *Popes* promiſe before, that it ſhould be at *Conſtantinople*; but when they urged the vaſtneſs of the expence, and unſuitableneſs of it to their preſent neceſſities; rather than a matter likely to be ſo much for the advantage of the *See* of *Rome* ſhould not go forward, the *Pope* proffers to advance a conſiderable ſum of money for the defraying the charges of the *Greeks*, both in coming to, and abiding at the *Council*. Which thoſe who underſtand not the *intrigues* of that *Court*, would have thought had been far better ſpent in a preſent ſupply of the *Greek Emperour*, the better to have enabled him to defend the *Chriſtian Churches* from the invaſion of their enemies. But any one who looks into the management of things, will eaſily diſcern upon what grounds the *Pope* choſe rather a dilatory proceeding, drawing the *Emperour* and ſo many *Biſhops* from *Greece* into *Italy* at that time, and all the while to feed them with rich Promiſes of Aſſiſtance upon condition that the *Union* was accompliſhed; but at laſt after two years attendance (for ſo long the *Council* continued at *Ferrara* and *Florence*) the poor *Emperour* was ſent home as empty as he came, and found things in a much worſe condition than he left them. Which could not rationally be expected to be otherwiſe. When the *Greeks* knew that the *Emperour* had aſſented that the *Council* ſhould be in *Italy*, they began ſtrangely to be troubled at it, ſome reſolved never to communicate more in the *Councils* of the *Union*; the *Patriarch* often ſaid, that he knew no good iſſue could come of a *Council* held in the *Popes* Territories; and if they muſt receive their allowance from the *Pope*, what did they elſe but therein confeſs themſelves his *Vaſſals* already, and therefore nothing could be expected from them, but to do juſt what he would have them; or elſe he might eaſily ſtarve them into conſent and approbation of his Will. For they ſhould be wholly under his power, and if he denyed their ſtipends, there was no poſſibility of getting from him. Was not this then like to be a very *free Council*? And it proved accordingly: for when they were at *Council* the *Pope* kept them ſhort enough, ſo that many of them were reduced to the greateſt neceſſities, and were not ſuffered unleſs by ſtealth to go ſo much as out of the *Gates* of the City, as *Beſſarion* himſelf once found, when he attempted it at *Florence*. But notwithſtanding all the perſwaſions of the wiſeſt of his *Councellors* at home to the contrary, notwithſtanding an Expreſs from the *Emperour Sigiſmund* to diſſwade the *Greek Emperour* in the preſent ſtate of affairs from this journey into *Italy*, yet he was reſolved upon it, and uſed all the arts he could before-hand to make

Sect. 2. *c.* 12.

C. 17, 18.

Sect. 6. *c.* 1.

Sect. 3. *c.* 12.

make choice of ſuch perſons as might be moſt for his purpoſe. Himſelf without the conſent of the *Patriarch*, appointing the *Legats* of the three
Sect. 3. *c.* 3. other *Patriarchs* of *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*: and when theſe *Patriarchs* had given no other inſtructions to theſe *Legats*, than that they ſhould have power to give their ſuffrages upon theſe terms and no other, *That all things were carried fairly, and defined Canonically, according to the decrees of Oecumenical Councils and Holy Fathers, ſo that nothing ſhould be added, changed, or innovated in the Symbol of Faith*; he at the inſtigation of one of the *Latin Legats*, then reſident at *Conſtantinople*, ſent away to the ſeveral
C. 4. *Patriarchs*, for the altering their inſtructions, upon a ſolemn Promiſe that the conditions mentioned by them ſhould however be exactly obſerved: which whether they were or no, will appear by the *ſeries* of the ſtory. And that we may better judge how *General* this *Council* was like to be, at the ſame time that theſe negotiations for *Union* were on foot, the *Council* of *Baſil* was then ſitting in oppoſition to *Pope Eugenius*; to them and to the *Pope* at the ſame time, the *Emperour* diſpatcheth ſeveral *Legats* with the ſame inſtructions, and both of them returned theirs to the *Emperour*, ſeek-
Cap. 12. ing as much as poſſible to outvy each other in large Promiſes if the *Greeks* did joyn in *Council* with them; both which the *Emperour* held in play till he could ſee with whom he was like to make the beſt terms. But as the *Romaniſts* are never backward at ſuch arts, they had cauſed it by their In-
C. 11. ſtruments to be reported at *Conſtantinople*, that the *Council* at *Baſil* had ſubmitted to the *Pope*, which within fifteen days was confuted by the arrival of the *Galleys* ſent from the *Council* to convey the *Greeks* over to it; upon which the *Emperour* had much to do to keep *Condelmerius* the *Popes Nephew* from fighting the *Councils Galleys* within his view; for he ſaid, he had expreſs order from the *Pope* to ſink them where-ever he met them. And were not theſe fair tendencies to a free and *General Council*? And yet af-
C. 15. ter all this, not full thirty *Biſhops* of the *Greek Church* went along with the *Patriarch*, as appears by the particular enumeration of them by *Sguropulus*: other *Officers* indeed, and *Monks*, there were to fill up the number; and yet theſe were more than the *Emperour* could well mould to his deſigns when he had them there. But the *Pope* ſoon accompliſhed the *Patri-*
Sect. 6. *c.* 3. *archs* prediction in keeping them bare enough, when they were at his finding, that he might be ſure to make them *hungry Greeks*, and then he ſuppoſed the other part of the *Proverb* would follow after. After the *Council* had begun at *Ferrara*, and continued there ſixteen *Seſſions*, wherein were many publick and ſolemn Diſputes between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, it was removed to *Florence*; where the *Greeks* ſtill underwent the ſame hardſhips, and the *Latins* ſought to hold out at Diſputations, till the *Greeks* neceſſity ſhould be ſo preſſing, as to neceſſitate them to an abſolute ſubmiſſion to the *Latin Church*. But, Reports and Meſſages coming from *Conſtantinople*, acquainting the *Emperour* with the difficulties the City was in, and the Progreſs which the enemies made; and finding, that during the ſitting of the *Council* the *Pope* ſtill put him off and gave him nothing but words, he therefore reſolves upon another courſe; he breaks all publick and *Conciliary* proceedings, pretending that no iſſue would come of thoſe Diſputations, calls a private *Cabal* of ſuch whom he knew fitteſt for his purpoſe to contrive ſome ſhorter way to put an end to this buſineſs. For
Sect. 8. *c.* 12. that end, makes choice firſt of ten *Perſons* of either ſide to agree upon ſome propoſals for Union, and acquaints none elſe of the *Greeks* with their tranſactions. When theſe things took no effect, the *Patriarch* who carryed on the *Emperour*'s deſign, often convenes the *Greeks* together, and in plain terms perſwades them to perfect diſſimulation, that ſince the neceſſity of affairs was ſuch, it would be hugely for their advantage, if in ſome things

things they did yield to the *Latins* desires. When they told him that in matters of Faith they could not do it, he replys, that if in twenty four Articles of *Faith* they yielded but in one, the soundness of *twenty three* would make amends for the *twenty fourth*. Such kind of Arguments as these were they driven to, to bring the *Greeks* to hearken to any terms of *Union*. After this, the *Latins* sent them an explication of Faith, which if the *Greeks* would subscribe, there might be an Union between them: C. 13. which being read among them, containing chiefly the acknowledgement of the *Procession from the Son*, all but the four who were the *Emperour*'s instruments in this work, unanimously disown it: and when the *Emperour* C. 14. urged them every one to deliver their *Suffrages* in writings, they tell him, it was contrary to the proceeding of all *Oecumenical Councils*: However, he told them he commanded them to do it. By which means rebuking some, cajoling others, he at last brought it by the multitude of *Suffrages*, that five C. 16. persons were selected among the rest, to draw up a *Form* of *Union*; which, though drawn up very favourably for the *Greeks*, yet, those who were C. 18. for it, did not easily carry it from those who opposed it. And yet to this the *Latins* returned no less than twelve *Exceptions*: Upon which the *Emperour* was fain to take a new course, and exclude those from the *Councils*, Sect. 9. c. 4. who were of greatest authority in obstructing his designs; but *Marcus Ephesius* still continued in so great opposition, that he publickly charged C. 5. the *Latins* opinion with *Heresie*. Notwithstanding all which, when it C. 8. was put to Suffrage, *Whether the Spirit did proceed from the Son*; for ten who affirmed it, there were seventeen who denyed it, which put them yet to more disquietment, and new *Councils*. At first the *Emperour* would vote himself, which when the *Patriarch* kept him from, some advised him to remove more of the Dissenters: but, instead of that, they used a more plausible and effectual way; the *Emperour* and *Patriarch* sent for them severally, and some they upbraided with ingratitude, others they caressed with all expressions of kindness, both by themselves and their *Instruments*: C. 9. Yet, at the last, they could get but 13 *Bishops* to affirm *the Procession from the Son*, all others being excluded the power of giving Suffrage; who were accustomed formerly to give it, such as the *great Officers* of the *Church* of *Constantinople*, the *Cœnobiarchs* and others; but to fill up the number, all the *Courtiers* were called in, who made no dispute, but did presently what the *Emperour* would have them do. Having dispatched this after this C. 10. manner, the other Controversies concerning the *Addition to the Creed*, *unleavened bread in the Eucharist*, *Purgatory*, *Pope's Supremacy*, the *Emperour* agreed them privately, never so much as communicating them to the *Greek Synod*. Among the *Emperours* Instruments, the *Bishop* of *Mitylene* Sect. 10. c. 1. went roundly to work, saying openly, *Let the Pope give me so many Florens to be distributed to whom I think fit, and I make no question but to bring them in very readily to subscribe the Union*; which he accordingly effected; and the C. 3. same way was taken with several others: by which, and other means, most of those who were excluded from the *Suffrages* were at last perswaded to *Subscribe*. This is the short account of the management of those affairs at *Florence*, which are more particularly and largely prosecuted by the Author, wherein we see what Clandestine Arts, what menaces, and insinuations, what threats and promises were used to bring the poor *Greeks* to consent to this pretended *Union*. For it afterwards appeared to be no more than pretended; for the infinitely greater number of *Bishops* at home refused it, and these very *Bishops* themselves, when they saw what arts were used in it, fell off from it again, and the *Emperour* found himself at last deceived in his great expectations of help from the *Latins*. Must we then acknowledge this for a *free and General Council*, which hath a pro-

miſe of *Infallibility* annexed to the definitions of it? Shall we from hence pronounce the *Greeks Doctrine* to be *Heretical*, when for all theſe proceedings, yet at laſt no more was agreed on, than that they did both believe *the Proceſſion from the Son*, without condemning the other opinion as *Heretical*, as you pretend, which the *Greeks* would never have conſented to? or *Anathematizing* the perſons who denyed it, as was uſual in former *General Councils*, who did ſuppoſe it not enough to have it virtually done by the poſitive definition, but did expreſly and formally do it. For when this *Anathematizing* diſſenters was propounded among the *Greeks* by *Beſſarion* of *Nice*, and *Iſidore* of *Ruſſia* (who for their great ſervice to the *Pope* in this buſineſs were made *Cardinals*) it was refuſed by the reſt, who were zealous promoters of the *Union*. Thus I have at large (more out of a deſign to vindicate the *Greek Church*, than being neceſſitated to it by any thing you produce) ſhewed, that there is no reaſon from *Authority* either before or after the *Council* of *Florence*, to charge the *Greek Church* with *Hereſie*.

§. 14. I now come to the examination of your *Theological Reaſon*, by which you think you have ſo evidently proved the *Greeks* Opinion to be *Hereſie*, that
P. 6. you introduce it with confidence in abundance. *But*, ſay you, *though this perſwaſion had not been atteſted by ſuch clouds of witneſſes, Theological Reaſon is ſo ſtrong a Foundation to confirm it, that I wonder how rational men could ever be induced to queſtion the truth of it.* Still you ſo unadviſedly place your expreſſions, that the ſharpeſt which you uſe againſt your adverſaries return with more force upon your ſelf: For it being ſo fully cleared, that theſe *clouds of witneſſes* are *Fathers*, *Councils*, *and Popes* againſt you, What do you elſe by this expreſſion, but exclude them from the number of *Rational men*, becauſe, forſooth, not acquainted with the depth of your *Theological Reaſon*? But, *Is not this to make all the Churches of Chriſtendom for many hundred years quite blind, and your ſelf only clear and ſharp-ſighted? Which ſwelling preſumption what Spirit it argues, &c.* You ſee we need no other weapons againſt you, but your immediate preceeding Words. What pity it is, that the *Fathers* and *Councils* had not been made acquainted with this grand Secret of your *Theological Reaſon*? but happy we that have it at ſo cheap a rate! but it may be that is it which makes us eſteem it no more. But ſuch as it is, it being *Reaſon* and *Theological* too, it deſerves the great-
Sect. 5. n. 1. eſt reſpect that may be, if it makes good its title. *His Lordſhip* had ſaid,
P. 24. *That ſince the Greeks, notwithſtanding this opinion of theirs, deny not the equality or Conſubſtantiality of the Perſons in the Trinity, he dares not deny them to be a true Church for this opinion, though he grants them erroneous in it.* To this you reply, *Is it* (*think you*) *enough to aſſert the Divinity, and Conſubſtantiality, and perſonal Diſtinction of the Holy Ghoſt* (*as the Biſhop ſays*) *to ſave from Hereſie the denyal of his Proceſſion from the Father and the Son as from one Principle*? But why is it not enough? your *Theological Reaſon* is that we want, to convince us of the contrary; That therefore follows. *Would not he that ſhould affirm the Son to be a diſtinct perſon from, and Conſubſtantial to the Father, but denyed his eternal Generation from him, be an Heretick? Or he, who held the Holy Ghoſt, diſtinct from, and Conſubſtantial to them both, but affirmed his Proceſſion to be from the Son only, and not from the Father, be guilty of Hereſie? It is then moſt evident, that not only an errour againſt the Conſubſtantiality and Diſtinction, but againſt the Origination, Generation, and Proceſſion of the Divine Perſons, is ſufficient matter of Hereſie.* Your faculty at *Clinching* your Arguments, is much better than of *Driving them in*: For your Concluſion is *moſt evident*, when your Premiſes have nothing *like evidence* in them. For, 1. He that doth acknowledge the *Son* to be *Conſubſtantial* with the *Father*, and yet a diſtinct perſon from him,

him, must needs therein acknowledge his *Eternal Generation*: for how he should be the *Son* of the same nature with *God*, and yet having a distinct *Personality* as a *Son*, without *Eternal Generation*; is so hard to understand, that I must confess, that whoever asserts the one, and denies the other, is so far from *Theological Reason*, that I think he hath no *common reason* in him. Is this then, think you, a parallel case with the Procession of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, which may be supposed *Consubstantial* to *Father* and *Son*, and a distinct person from both, without any Connotation of respect to the *Personality* of the *Son*, as a principle of *Spiration*? 2. He that should affirm the *Procession* of the *Spirit* only from the *Son*, and not the *Father*, would speak much more absurdly than the *Greeks* do; for thereby he would destroy the *Fathers* being the *fountain* or *principle* of *Origination*, as to the distinct *Hypostases* of *Son* and *Spirit*; he would plainly and directly thwart the *Creed* of the *second General Council*; and, which is more, would speak directly against expres words of *Scripture*, which say, *The Spirit proceeds from the Father*: which by the consent of the *Christian Church*, hath been interpreted of the Eternal Procession. And by this time, I hope you begin to have better thoughts of rational men, than to make such a wonder at their questioning the *Greeks Heresie*; but if this be your *Theological Reason*, one scruple of *common reason* goes far beyond it.

§. 15. We have had a fair proof of your skill at *charging*, we shall now see how good you are at standing your ground. Your main defence lyes in a distinction which ruines you; for you think to ward off all the citations his Lordship produceth against you out of the *Schoolmen* and others, that the *Greeks* and *Latins* agree with each other, *in eandem fidei sententiam, upon the same sentence of Faith, but differ only in words*, by saying, *That the* Greeks *must be distinguished into Ancient and Modern. The Ancient*, you say, *expressed themselves per filium, but they meant thereby à filio: whereas the Modern* Greeks *will not admit that expression à filio, but per filium only, and that too in a sense dissignificative to à filio.* This is the substance of all the answer you give, both in general, and to the particular authorities for several pages; The disproof therefore of this distinction must by your own Confession, make all those testimonies stand good against you; which I shall do by two things. 1. By shewing that the *Ancient Greeks* did assert as much as the Modern do in this Controversie. 2. That those who speak expresly of the *Modern Greeks*, do deny their difference from us in any matter of Faith. 1. That the Ancient *Greeks* did assert as much as the *Modern* do. By the Ancient *Greeks*, we must here understand those who writ before the *Schoolmen*, whose testimonies you would answer by this distinction. Now nothing can be more clear than that those *Greeks* who writ before them, did as peremptorily deny *the Procession from the Son*, as any of the *Modern Greeks* do. We have already produced the testimony of *Theodoret*, who accounts the contrary opinion blasphemous and impious; and that of *Photius*, who so largely and vehemently disputes against the Procession from the Son. To whom I shall add two more of great reputation, not only in the *Greek*, but in the *Latin Church*; and those are *Theophylact* and *Damascen*. *Theophylact*, whether he lived in the time of *Photius*, about 870, as the common opinion is, or more probably in the time of *Michael Cerularius*, as great an adversary as *Photius* to the *Latins*, about 1070. yet was long enough before the *Schoolmen*: for *Peter Lombard* flourished *A. D.* 1145. and *Thomas* and *Bonaventure*, about 1260. So that in this respect he must be one of the *Ancient Greeks*; He therefore delivers his opinion as expresly as may be in his *Commentaries* on St. *John*; and that not as his own private opinion, but as the common sense of the *Greek Church*; for there taking occasion to speak

P. 7. n. 9.

Theophylact. in Joh. 3. 26.

how the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, For the Latins, ſaith he, *apprehend it amiſs, and miſtaking it, ſay, That the Spirit proceeds from the Son. But we anſwer, That it is one thing to ſay, The Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, which we aſſert; and another, that it proceeds from the Son, which we deny; for it hath no teſtimony of Scripture for it, and then we muſt bring in two principles, the Father and the Son.* And withal adds, that when *Chriſt* breathed the Spirit on his Diſciples, it is not to be underſtood *perſonally*, but in regard of the gift of remiſſion of ſins; after which, he briefly and comprehenſively ſets down the opinion of the *Greek Church*: *Believe thou that the Spirit doth proceed from the Father, but is given to men by the Son; and let this be the Rule of ſound doctrine to thee.* And what now do the *Modern Greeks* ſay more than *Theophylact* did? or what do they ſay leſs; for they acknowledge, that the *Spirit* is the *Spirit* of the *Son* as well as he? To the ſame purpoſe *Damaſcen*, who lived between the 6. and 7. *Synod*, about *A. D.* 730. in the time of *Leo Iſaurus*, delivers the ſenſe of the *Greek Church* in his time concerning this Article. *It muſt be conſidered,* ſaith he, *That we aſſert not the Father to be from any, but that he is ſaid to be the Father of the Son. We ſay not, that the Son is a proper cauſe, neither the Father; but we ſay, the Son is from the Father, and of the Father. The Holy Spirit, we ſay, is from the Father, and of the Father; but we ſay not, the Spirit is from the Son, but we call him the Spirit of the Son; And we confeſs, that by the Son, the Spirit is manifeſted and given to us.* Theſe words are ſo plain, that the *Patriarch Hieremias* producing them, ſaith, *Nothing can be more clear and evident than theſe words are.* But the *Philoſopher*, who was ſo much pleaſed to ſee the *Aſs mumble his Thiſtles*, could not take much leſs contentment to ſee how the *Schoolmen* handle this teſtimony of *Damaſcen*. For, being very loth that ſo zealous an aſſertor of *Images*, ſhould in any thing ſeem oppoſite to the *Church* of *Rome*, they very handſomly, and with wonderful ſubtilty bring him off, by admiring the wiſdom and caution he uſeth, in theſe words. So your own St. *Bonaventure*, whoſe teſtimony you think ſo conſiderable, as to produce at large, *Tamen ipſe cautè loquitur, unde non dicit quod Spiritus non eſt à filio, ſed dicit, non dicimus à filio*, which you put in great letters the more to be taken notice of. But, I pray, What was it which *Damaſcen* was there delivering of? was it not the ſenſe of the *Greek Church* concerning the *Perſons* of the *Trinity*? and how could he otherwiſe have expreſſed it, than by *non dicimus*; but if this muſt argue what *Bonaventure* and *you* would have from it (for this is the only teſtimony you give of your diſtinction of *Ancient* and *Modern Greeks*) will it not as well hold for the other things before mentioned concerning the *Father* and the *Son*, where he uſeth *dicimus & non dicimus*, as well as here? And therefore *Aquinas* was much wiſer, who plainly condemns *Damaſcen* for a *Neſtorian* in this, *licet à quibuſdam dicatur, &c.* although it be ſaid by ſome, that in theſe words *he neither affirms or denies it*: wherein I am much miſtaken, if he reflects not on *Bonaventure*. *Vaſquez*, *Petavius*, and ſeveral others think to bring *Damaſcen* off by the *diſtinctions* of *à filio*, and *per filium*, much to your purpoſe: but in the great diſpute at the *Council* at *Florence* between *Beſſarion* and *Marcus Epheſius*, about the importance of the Articles ἐξ & διὰ, *Marcus Epheſius* produceth the words of *Damaſcen* expreſſly, that the *Spirit doth not proceed from the Son, but by the Son*, whereby it is plain, that he underſtood *per filium*, in oppoſition to *à filio*. And *Beſſarion* had nothing elſe to return in anſwer to it, but that he could produce but

Οἱ γὰρ Λατῖνοι κακῶς ταῦτα ἐκλεχόμενοι καὶ παρανοοῦντες φασὶν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεται. Theophylact. in Joh. 3.

Πίστευε σὺ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μὲν προϊέναι, διὰ υἱοῦ δὲ χορηγεῖσθαι τοῖς κτίσεσι· καὶ ἔστω ἔσαι σοι καιὼν ὀρθοδοξίας. Id. ib.

Χρὴ γινώσκειν, ὅτι τὸ πατέρα οὐ λέγομεν ἐκ τινός, λέγομεν δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦ υἱοῦ πατέρα· οὐδὲ υἱὸν αἴτιον λέγομεν αὐτόν, οὐδὲ πατέρα· λέγομεν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγομεν, καὶ πνεῦμα πατρὸς ὀνομάζομεν, ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν· πνεῦμα δὲ υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν. —— καὶ διὰ υἱοῦ πεφανερῶσθαι καὶ μεταδίδοσθαι ἡμῖν ὁμολογοῦμεν. Joh. Damaſcenus de Trinit. c. 8. & l. 1. de Orthodoxa fide c. 11.

Acta Theolog. Wirten. p. 220.

P. 8.

Sum. 1. q. 36. art. 2. Vaſquez in Thom. To. 2. diſ. 146. c. 7. Petavius dogm. Theol. To. 2. l. 7. c. 17.

οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. Hiſt. Concil. Florent. ſect. 8. c. 15. p. 239.

one out of *Antiquity*, who ſaid ſo. Thus we ſee, if *Theophylact* and *Damaſen*, as well as *Theodoret* and *Photius*, be *Ancient Greeks*; your diſtinction comes to nothing. But beſides this, it appears by the diſputations of *Hugo Etherianus* againſt the *Greeks*, who lived, ſaith *Bellarmin*, *A. D.* 1160. ſtill extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, that the *Greeks* held the very ſame then that they do now. And ſo in the *Synod* of *Bar* in *Apulia*, when *Anſelm* diſputed ſo ſtoutly againſt the *Greeks*, that *Pope Urban* ſaid, he was, *alterius orbis Papa*, as the ſtory is related by *Eadmerus* and *Wilhelmus Malmesburienſis*; it appears, they denied the *Proceſſion of the Spirit abſolutely from the Son*; (and this was *A. D.* 1096.) as is evident from the Letter of *Hildebertus* to him about the publiſhing his Diſputation, and from the *Book* of *Anſelm* ſtill extant on that ſubject. We find not therefore any ground for this diſtinction of yours concerning the *Ancient* and *Modern Greeks*; and therefore they who ſaid, that there was no real difference in any matter of Faith between the *Ancient Greeks and Latins*, muſt be underſtood as well of the *Modern Greeks*, as them: Their words being no more capable of ſuch a tolerable interpretation as you ſpeak of, than the words of any of the *Modern Greeks* are.

Eadmer. de vita Anſelm. l. 2. Malmesbur. de geſtis Pontif. Angl. l. 1.

§. 16. His *Lordſhip* was proving, that the point was not fundamental, that the *Greeks* and *Latins* differed in, *from that acknowledgement of Peter Lombard, and the Schoolmen; that is to ſay, The Holy Ghoſt is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, and that he is, or proceeds from the Father and the Son, is not to ſpeak different things, but the ſame ſenſe in different words. Now in this cauſe*, ſaith he, *where the words differ, but the ſentence of Faith is the ſame*, (*penitùs eadem*) *even altogether the ſame, can the point be fundamental? But*, ſay you, *he was to prove, that ſuch as were in grievous errour in Divinity, erred not fundamentally; and, for proof of this, he alledges ſuch as have no real errour at all in Divinity.* But do you not herein wilfully miſtake his *Lordſhips* meaning? For in the Paragraph foregoing, his *Lordſhip* firſt declares his own judgement concerning the denying the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, *viz. That he did acknowledge it to be a grievous errour in Divinity*: but yet he could not judge the *Greeks* guilty of a fundamental errour, which he proves by a double medium. 1. *Becauſe they did not thereby deny the Equality and Conſubſtantiality of the perſons.* 2. *Becauſe divers learned men were of opinion*, [*that à filio, & per filium*] *in the ſenſe of the Greek Church, was but a queſtion in modo loquendi, and therefore not fundamental*; now for this he produceth thoſe teſtimonies. Now, I pray, do you put no difference between *the making the denial of a Propoſition to be an errour, and the ſaying, that ſuch perſons are guilty of the denial of that Propoſition*? His Lordſhip grants the *denial of the Proceſſion to be a grievous errour in Divinity*, but he queſtioned (*as the Greeks expreſſed themſelves*, for thoſe very words he inſerts) whether they were guilty of *denying that Propoſition*, as appears by the authorities of the *Schoolmen*, and therefore certainly much leſs guilty of a fundamental errour. Thus you ſee his *Lordſhip* fully proves what he intends; for if they agreed in ſenſe, they were much leſs guilty of a fundamental errour, than if they had plainly denied the Proceſſion, which he ſuppoſeth from thoſe *Authorities* that they did not. And therefore when you *Sarcaſtically* ask, *Is not this ſtrong Logick?* The only anſwer I ſhall give you, is, That if you apprehend it not to be ſo, it is *becauſe of the weakneſs of your Theological Reaſon.* And therefore you put his *Lordſhips* Defender on a ſtrange task, *to prove from thoſe Authorities, that thoſe Greeks who err grievouſly in Divinity, erre not fundamentally.* When the only deſign of his *Lordſhip*, in producing thoſe Authorities, was to ſhew, that according to their opinion, the *Greeks* were ſo far from erring fundamentally, that *they did not erre grievouſly in Divinity.* And to this purpoſe the citation of *Peter Lombard* was pertinent,

P. 25.

P. 8.

who

who ſaith, That becauſe the Greeks acknowledge, that the Holy Ghoſt is the Spirit
Sentent. 1. diſt. 11. *of the Son, though he doth not proceed from him; therefore the difference between the Greeks and the Latins, is in words, and not in ſenſe*; but, you ſay, *He ſpeaks only of ſuch as differed in words and not in ſubſtance*; as though he put a difference between the *Greeks*, that ſome differed in words, and others really, which is quite beſide his meaning: for he takes not the leaſt notice of any ſuch difference among themſelves; but ſaith, The difference it ſelf concerning the *Proceſſion*, the *Greeks* acknowledging the *Holy Ghoſt* to be the *Spirit* of the *Son*, is more *verbal* than *real*. And that the preſent *Greeks* ſay full as much, is evident; for they acknowledge the
In ſent. l. 1. diſt. 11. art. 1. q. 1. ſame things in expreſs words. The teſtimony of *Bonaventure* hath been already conſidered, as far as concerns *Damaſcen*; as for the reſt, it was ſufficient for his *Lordſhips* purpoſe, to produce ſuch a Confeſſion from ſo bitter an enemy of the *Greeks*, as *Bonaventure* was (ſo his Lordſhip in his Marginal Citation ſays truly of him, *licèt Græcis infenſiſſimus, &c.*) that he doth not deny but that ſalvation might be had without the Article of *Filioque*; but whether on that ſuppoſition there were ſufficient reaſon to add it to the *Creed*, will be conſidered afterwards. *Though* Bonaventure *held the* Greeks *to be Hereticks and Sciſmaticks*, I hope you do not think, that is Argument enough to perſwade us that they were ſo. *That any thing, without which ſalvation might have been had before, may, by the definition of your Church, become ſo neceſſary, that men cannot be ſaved without the belief of it*, had need be more than barely aſſerted either by *Bonaventure*, or you; and we muſt wait for the proof of it, for any thing here ſaid by either of you. That the *Greeks* might be excuſed by *Ignorance*, before ſuch *Declaration* of your *Church concerning the Filioque*, and not be excuſed after through greater ignorance of any ſuch *Power* in your *Church*, *to declare ſuch things to be matters of faith*, is an aſſertion not eaſie to be ſwallowed by ſuch as have any ſtrength of *Logick*, or one *drachm* of *Theological Reaſon*: Or elſe it is a very ſtrange thing, you ſhould think it ſufficient for the *Greeks* to know, what your *Church* had declared without an antecedent knowledge that your *Church had power to declare*. How much you anſwer at random, appears by your anſwering *Aquinas* his *teſtimony*, inſtead of that of *Jodocus Clictoveus*, as is plain enough in his Lordſhips Margin; and you might have been eaſily ſatisfied that it was ſo, if you had taken the pains to look into either of them. But the art of it was, *Aquinas* his teſtimony might be eaſily anſwered, becauſe he ſpeaks only by hear-ſay, *concerning the opinion of ſome certain Greeks*; but *Clictoveus* his was cloſe to the purpoſe, who plainly confeſſeth, that the difference of the *Ancient Greeks was more in words, and the manner of explaining the Proceſſion than in the thing it ſelf*. This therefore you thought fit to ſlide by, and anſwer *Aquinas* for him. Your anſwer to *Scotus* depends on the former diſtinction of *Ancient* and *Modern Greeks*, and therefore falls with it. *Bellarmin*'s anſwer concerning *Damaſcen*, and your own after *Bonaventure* of his *non dicimus*, hath been ſufficiently diſproved already. What *Tolet* holds, or the *Lutherans* deny, the words of neither being of either ſide produced, deſerve no further conſideration.

§. 17. Ibid. You tell us, his Lordſhips Argument depends upon this, *That the Holy Ghoſt may be equal and conſubſtantial with the Son, though it proceed not from him*; *which*, you ſay, *is a matter too deep for his Lordſhip to wade into*. But any indifferent Reader would think it had been your concernment to have ſhewn the contrary, that thereby you might ſeem to make good ſo heavy a charge, as that of *Hereſie*, againſt the whole *Greek Church*. For, if the *Holy Ghoſt* cannot be equal and conſubſtantial with the *Son*, if it proceeds not from the *Son*; then it follows, that they who deny this Proceſſion, muſt deny that

Equality

Equality and *Conſubſtantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Son*: which you ought to prove, to make good your charge of Hereſie. But on the other ſide, if the *Spirit* may be proved to be *God* by ſuch Arguments as do not at all infer his *Proceſſion from the Son*; then his equality and conſubſtantiality doth not depend upon that Proceſſion: for I ſuppoſe you grant, that it is the *Unity of Eſſence* in the Perſons which make them equal and conſubſtantial; but we may ſufficiently prove the *Spirit* to be *God* by ſuch Arguments as do not infer the Proceſſion from the *Son*; as I might eaſily make appear by all the Arguments inſiſted on to that purpoſe: but I only mention that which the ſecond *General Council* thought moſt cogent to that purpoſe, which is the *Spirit's Eternal Proceſſion from the Father*; if that proves the *Spirit to be God*, then its equality with the Son, is proved without his Proceſſion from the Son; for I hope you will not ſay, that the proving his Proceſſion from the Father, doth imply Proceſſion from the Son too: becauſe the Proceſſion cannot be ſuppoſed to be from the Eſſence, for then the *Spirit* would proceed from it ſelf, but from the *Hypoſtaſis*, and therefore one cannot imply the concurrence of the other. And ſince you pretend ſo much to underſtand theſe depths; before you renew a charge of Hereſie againſt the *Greek Church* in this particular, make uſe of your *Theological reaſon* in giving an intelligible Anſwer to theſe Queſtions. 1. Why the *Spirit* may not be equal and conſubſtantial to the other Perſons in the *Trinity*, ſuppoſing his Proceſſion to be only from the *Father*, as the *Son* to be equal and conſubſtantial with *them*, when his *Generation* is only from the *Father*. 2. If the Proceſſion from the *Son* be neceſſary to make the Spirit conſubſtantial with the *Son*, why is not Generation of the *Son* by the *Spirit* neceſſary to make the *Son* conſubſtantial with the *Spirit*? 3. If the *Spirit* doth proceed from *Father* and *Son* as diſtinct *Hypoſtaſes*, how he can proceed from theſe *Hypoſtaſes* as one principle by one common Spiration, without confounding their *Perſonalities*? or elſe, ſhew how two diſtinct *Hypoſtaſes* always remaining ſo, can concur in the ſame numerical action *ad intra*? 4. If there be ſuch a neceſſity of believing this as an Article of Faith, why hath not *God* thought fit to reveal to us, the diſtinct *emanations* of the *Son* and *Spirit*; and wherein the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son* may be conceived as diſtinct from the *Proceſſion of the Spirit*, when both equally agree in the ſame *Eſſence*, and neither of them expreſs the *Perſonality* of the *Father*? Either I ſay undertake intelligibly to reſolve theſe things, or elſe furceaſe your charge of *Hereſie* againſt the *Greek Church*, and upbraid not his Lordſhip for not entring into theſe depths. Methinks, there being confeſſed to be Depths on both ſides, might teach you a little more modeſty in handling them, and much more charity to men who differ about them. For you may ſee, the *Greeks* want not great plauſibleneſs of reaſon on their ſide, as well as authority of *Scripture* and *Fathers*, plain for them, but not ſo againſt them. As long therefore as the *Greek Church* confeſſeth the *Divinity*, *Conſubſtantiality*, *Eternal Proceſſion* of the *Spirit*; and acknowledgeth it to be *the Spirit of the Son*, there muſt be ſomething more in it than the bare denial of the Proceſſion from the Son, which muſt make you ſo eager in your charge of Hereſie againſt her. The truth is, there is ſomething elſe in the matter; by this Article of *Filioque*, the Authority of the *Church* of *Rome* in matters of Faith is ſtruck at: and therefore if this be an *Hereſie*, it muſt be on the account of denying the plenitude of her power in matters of Faith, as *Anſelm* and *Bonaventure* ingenuouſly confeſs it, and plead it on that account. And therefore wiſe men are not apt to believe, but that if the *Church* of *Rome* had not been particularly concerned in this *addition* to the *Creed*; if the *Greeks* would have ſubmitted in all other things to the *Church* of *Rome*, this charge of Hereſie would

would soon be taken off the File. But, as things stand, if she be not found guilty of Heresie, she may be found as *Catholick* as *Rome*, and more too, and therefore there is a necessity for it, she must be contented to bear it, for it is not consistent with the Interest of the *Church* of *Rome*, that she should be free from *Heresie*, *Schism*, &c. But if she hath no stronger Adversaries to make good the charge than you, she may satisfie her self, that though the blows be rude, yet they are given her by feeble hands. For let us now make way for *Theological reason* to enter the lists armed *Cap-a-pe* in Mood and Figure. For now at last you tell us, *You will argue in Form* P. 11. *against his Lordship and the Greek Church together.* And thus it proceeds, *If the Greeks errour be not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost, then (according to the Bishops own distinction) they have lost all assistance of that blessed Spirit, and are become no true Church; But their errour is not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost: Therefore,* &c. *The Major or first Proposition contains the Bishops own Doctrine, the Minor or second Proposition* (wherein you learnedly tell us, what the Major and Minor in Syllogisms are) *you thus prove. All errours, specially opposite to the particular and personal Procession of the Holy Ghost, are (according to all Divines) not only errours concerning, but errours against the Holy Ghost: But the Greeks errour is opposite to the particular and personal Procession of the Holy Ghost, as is already proved:* Ergo, *their errour is not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost; whose assistance therefore they have lost, not only according to the first, but even latter branch of the Bishops distinction: and consequently remain no true Church.* Now who is there, that out of meer pity can find in his heart not to yield this to you, when you have been at such pains to prove it? But things set out with the greatest formality have not always the most solidity in them. All the force of this Argument, such as it is, lies in this, that his Lordship had said, *That the errour of the Greeks was rather about the Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost, than against the Holy Ghost*, which he after explains, by saying, *It was not such an errour, as did destroy the equality or Consubstantiality of the Spirit with the other persons of the Trinity*; I pray now take his Lordships explication of himself, and you must form your Argument after another way than you have done: but you saw well enough, that you could not make any shew of an Argument but meerly from words. If I thought it worth considering, it were easie to tell you, that what is only against the Procession from the Son, is not thereby against the *Holy Ghost*, because it may be the *Holy Ghost*, i. e. *the third person in the Trinity*, though it proceed only from the *Father*. And as well you might say, that whatever Doctrine denies *the Son to be begotten of the Spirit*, is not only *concerning*, but *against* the *Son*, and urge the consequences upon as good terms as you do about the *Spirit*: But so trifling an Argument is too much honoured by any serious confutation. And, it seems, you were something sensible of it your self, when you say, *His Lordship seemed to have provided against the force of it* (as who would not?) *by hinting a difference between errours fundamental and not fundamental; which point I shall purposely examine in the following Chapter.* When you therefore come to *hold forth* what is now but *hinted at*, I shall readily hearken to what you have to say.

Thus for any thing you have produced to the contrary, it sufficiently appears, that the *Greek Church* is very unjustly charged with *Heresie* by you, and that those testimonies which his Lordship produced, would as well hold for the *Modern* as *Ancient Greeks*: to which I might add the judgement of *others* of your own side, who speak as much concerning the *Modern Greeks* as *Thomas à Jesu*, *Azorius* and others; but I think not that way of arguing to have much force on either side, and therefore pass it over.

And

And come to the debate of the *Filioque*, *with which*, you ſay, *his Lordſhip begins to quibble, on occaſion of the Popes inſerting it into the Creed.* But I am quite of another mind, I think he ſpeaks very ſeriouſly, and with a great deal of reaſon, when he ſaith, *And* Rome *in this particular ſhould be more moderate, if it be but becauſe this Article* (*Filioque*) *was added to the Creed by her ſelf. And 'tis hard to add and Anathematize too.* For what you ſay to this, *of the Holy Ghoſts having leave to aſſiſt the Church, in adding expreſſions for the better explication of any Article of Faith: and then the Pope hath leave and command too, to Anathematize all ſuch, as ſhall not allow the uſe of ſuch expreſſions:* I commend you, that when you muſt beg ſomething, you would beg all that was to be had at once; but, before you perſwade us to the digeſting ſuch crudities as theſe are, prove but theſe following things. 1. Where it is, that there is any promiſe of the *Holy Ghoſts* aſſiſtance, in adding any *Articles* to the *Creed*, under pretence of better expreſſions for explication of them? 2. Supposing ſuch an aſſiſtance, what ground is there to impoſe ſuch additional *expreſſions*, ſo that thoſe who admit them not, muſt be guilty of Hereſie, and conſequently (by your principles) incur eternal damnation 3. How thoſe expreſſions can be accounted a better *explication* of an Article of Faith, which contain ſomething not implied in, nor neceſſarily deduced from, any other Article of Faith? 4. If this *aſſiſtance* be promiſed to the *Church*, how any one part of that *Church*, as great a part ſtifly oppoſing ſuch additional expreſſions, can claim that aſſiſtance to it ſelf; the other parts of the *Catholick Church*, utterly denying it? 5. If an aſſiſtance as to ſuch things be promiſed the *Church*, why may it not be more reaſonably preſumed to be in an *Oecumenical Council*, as that at *Epheſus* forbidding ſuch additions, than in any part of the *Church*, which after ſuch a Decree ſhall directly contradict it? 6. What right can the *Church* have to *Anathematize* any for the not uſing ſuch expreſſions, which that *Church* which determins the uſe of them, doth acknowledge to be only expreſſions for better explication of an Article of Faith? and conſequently the denial of them cannot amount to the denial of an Article of *Faith*; but only of the better *explication* of it. 7. If all theſe things be granted, how comes the *Pope, not only to have leave, but command too, to Anathematize all ſuch as uſe not theſe expreſſions?* Where is that Command extant? how comes it to be limited to him? Is he expreſſed in it? or doth it by neceſſary conſequence follow from it? What good would it do us, to ſee but one of theſe proved, which you very fairly beg in the lump together: And, till you have proved them all, you may aſſure your ſelf, that we ſhall never believe that the *Pope* hath ſo much as *leave*, much leſs *command, to Add and Anathematize too.*

§. 12. P. 11.

P. 25.

As to the *Filioque*, you grant, *That many hundred years had paſſed from the time of the Apoſtles, before Filioque was added to the Nicene Creed, and more ſince the declarations and decrees were ſufficiently publiſhed, and in all theſe years ſalvation was had without mention of Filioque.* A fair Conceſſion; and nothing is wanting to deſtroy all that you had ſaid before, but only this, that what was not once neceſſary to ſalvation, cannot by any after-declaration of the Church be made neceſſary, as ſhall be abundantly manifeſted in the *Controverſie of fundamentals.* What follows, muſt be more particularly conſidered, becauſe therein you would fain remove the Article of *Filioque*, from being the cauſe of the *Schiſm* between the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, and impute it wholly to the *Pride* and *Ambition* of the *Eaſtern Prelates.* Your words are. *But it is alſo true, That the addition of Filioque to the Creed, was made many years before the difference brake out between the Latins and Greeks; ſo that the inſerting this word* (*Filioque*) *into the Creed, was not the firſt occaſion of Schiſm: But grudges ariſing among the*

P. 11, 12.

Greeks, who had been a large flouriſhing Church, with a number of moſt learned and zealous Prelates, and held the Articles ſtill, though upon emptier heads; ſuch, quickly filled with wind, thinking their ſwelling places, and great City of Conſtantinople, *might hold up againſt* Rome; *they began to quarrel, not for places (that was too mean a motive for ſuch as look'd ſo big) but firſt they would make it appear, they could teach* Rome; *nay, they ſpied out Hereſies in it (the old way of all Hereticks) and ſo fell to queſtion the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; and muſt needs have Filioque out of the Creed.* Theſe words of yours lay the charge of *Schiſm* on the *Greeks* wholly, and therefore, in order to our vindication of them from that, two things muſt be enquired into. 1. Whether it was in your *Churches Power* to make the *Addition* of *Filioque* to the *Creed.* 2. Whether the *Greeks Ambition and Pride* were the only cauſe of the *Separation* between the *Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches.*

1. Concerning the addition of *Filioque*, two things muſt be enquired into; 1. When it began, and by whom it was added to the *Creed.* 2. Whether they who added it, had power ſo to do, and to impoſe on all others the uſe of it.

1. Concerning the time of this *Addition*, nothing ſeems more dark in *Church Hiſtory* than the preciſe and punctual time of it. And ſo much
P. 164. you acknowledge your ſelf elſewhere. But it ſeems, it is your concernment to ſay, *That the Addition was made before the difference brake out.* To that I anſwer, if you mean, that in ſome Churches the *Proceſſion from the Son* was acknowledged before that difference, I grant it, as is clear by ſome *Councils of Toledo*; and, that the doctrine of the Proceſſion was received in *France* too, about the time of *Charles the Great*, I acknowledge, and that it was admitted into the ſolemn Offices of the Church; but, that it was added to the *Nicene* and *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* to be received by all *Churches*; ſo that it ſhould not be lawful for any to uſe that *Creed* without ſuch Addition, that I deny to have been before the *Schiſm*, but aſſert it to have been a great occaſion of it. It is acknowledged, that in *Spain*, ſeveral *Councils of Toledo*, in their profeſſion of Faith, do mention the Proceſſion from the *Son*; but this they delivered only as their own private judgements, and not as the publick *Creed* received by all
Dogmat. Theol. Tom. 2. l. 7. c. 2. Churches. For, *Petavius* confeſſeth, that, *in Symbolo ipſo nihil adjecerunt, they added nothing at all to the Creed.* And, although the cuſtom of ſinging the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* in the *Liturgy*, ſeems firſt to have begun in *Spain*, from whom *Petavius* ſuppoſeth both the *French* and *Germans* received it; yet, even there it appears, it was not univerſally received. For, the Church of *Sevil* contented it ſelf ſtill with the *Mozarabick Liturgy*, in which only the bare *Nicene Creed* was uſed. You tell us indeed, *That the*
P. 164. *inſerting the Article in the Councils of Toledo, is ſuppoſed to have been done upon the authority of an Epiſtle they had received from Pope Leo:* which, though it be not barely ſuppoſed, but aſſerted with great confidence by *Baronius*; yet, (as moſt other things in him which are brought to advance the *Pope*'s Authority) it hath no other ground but his confident aſſer-
Baron. To. 5. An. 447. n. 58. tion. There being not the leaſt ſhadow of proof for it, but only that this *Leo*, in a certain Epiſtle of his to the *Spaniards*, did, *once upon a time*, mention, that the *Son proceeded from the Father.* Therefore, in *Spain*, I grant the Doctrine to be received; I deny the *Addition* to be made to the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed*: although it be read, as added to it in the 8. *or* 10. *Council of Toledo*, under *Receſuintus Anno Dom.* 653. But this was ſtill only the declaration of their own Faith, in this Article, and no impoſing it on others. In *France*, that it began to be received in publick uſe *A. D.* 809. muſt be acknowledged by the proceedings of the *Legats* from the *Council* of *Aquiſgrane* to *Pope Leo* 3. But, it appears as clearly, that *Pope Leo* did then

then condemn the uſe of it, as will be ſhewed afterwards. When it ſhould creep into the *Athanaſian Creed*, ſeems as hard to find out, as when firſt added to the *Conſtantinopolitan*; but, if we believe *Pithœus*, the whole *Creed* was of a *French Compoſition* (there being many Arguments to perſwade us, it never was made by *Athanaſius*; of which, in their due place) and *Voſſius* adds, That it is very probable it was compoſed about the time of *Charles the Great*, the Controverſie being then ſo rife about the Proceſſion. But that ſeems the leſs probable, becauſe the Article of *Filioque* is not found in the *Ancient Copies* of that *Creed*. For *Spalatenſis* ſaith, *That in all the Greek Copies he had ſeen, there was only mention made of the Proceſſion from the Father.* And the *Patriarch Cyril* ſaith, *That not only the Symbol of* Athanaſius *is adulterated among the Latins; but, that it is proved to be ſo by the more ancient and genuine Copies.* But, however this be, we deny not but the Article of Proceſſion from the *Son*, grew into uſe, eſpecially in the *Gallican* and *Spaniſh Churches*, before the *Schiſm* broke out between the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*; but, our enquiry is not concerning that, but concerning the time when it was ſo added to the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed*, that it was required to be uſed only with that addition. For this you tell us, *That* Hugo Eterianus *affirms, that it was added by the Pope in a full Council at* Rome, *but he names not the Pope.* So likewiſe the *Latin Divines*, at the *Council* of *Florence*, pretended ſtill, that it was added by the *Pope* in a full *Council*, but very carefully forbare the mention of the perſon, or the punctual time. But, it is your unhappineſs, if there be divers opinions to be followed, to make choice of the moſt improbable; as you do here, when you embrace that of *Socolovius*, which is, *That the Fathers of the firſt Council at* Conſtantinople, *ſending the Confeſſion of their Faith to Pope* Damaſus, *and his Council at* Rome; *the Pope and Council at* Rome *approved of their ſaid Confeſſion; but yet added, by way of explication, the word* Filioque *to the Article which concerned the Holy Ghoſt; and this they did, to ſignifie, that the Holy Ghoſt as true God, proceeded from the Son, and was not made or created by him, as ſome Hereticks in thoſe times began to teach. Neither doth he,* ſay you, *affirm this without citation of ſome credible authority.* I could wiſh you had produced it, not only for our ſatisfaction, but of the more learned men of your own ſide, who look on this as an improbable fiction. *Bellarmin* produceth many Arguments againſt it, ſaying, That no mention is made of it in the *Councils*, or *Theodoret's Hiſtory*, who particularly relates the Letters of the *Council* to *Damaſus*, and his to the *Council*; that *Leo* 3. cauſed the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* to be inſcribed in a ſilver Table, without that Addition; that the *third Council* of *Toledo* uſed the *Creed* without that Addition; that the *Greeks* did not begin this *Controverſie* till *A. D.* 600. And how could they poſſibly charge the *Latins* with breaking the *Canons* of the *third Oecumenical*, when, (according to this opinion) it was added in the *ſecond? Petavius* is ſo great a friend to your opinion, that in plain terms he calls it *ridiculous*, and abundantly confutes that imagination of its being inſerted, becauſe of the Hereſie of the *Nicolaïta*, as *Manuel Calecas* calls it, who with *Ariſtinus* are all thoſe worſhipful Authorities which this opinion ſtands on. But, ſetting aſide the contrary Authorities to theſe, any one, who is any thing verſed in this Controverſie, muſt needs eſteem this the moſt improbable account that can be given of this Addition. For, if this were true, how little did the *Latins* at the *Council* at *Florence* underſtand their buſineſs; when, if they could have produced ſuch an Addition before the *Epheſine Council*, all the *Greeks* objecti-

Magni Athanaſii ſymbolum, quamvis Trevyris ut plerique tradiderunt, i. e. in Gallia à Theologo tamen inter illos doctiſſimo acutiſſimoque ſcriptum. P. Pithœus Opuſc. de proceſſ. Sp. S.
Voſſius de tribus ſymbol. Addend. ad p. 55. 31. Spalatenſis de Rep. Eccleſ. Tom. 3. l. 7. c. 10. ſect. 124.
Patriarch. Cyril. ep. ad Joh. utenbogard. p. 404.

P. 16.

Bellarmin de Chriſto l. 2. c. 21. ſect. ult.

Petav. Dogmat. Theol. de Trinit. To. 2. l. 7. c. 2.

ons had come to nothing? If this were true, how little did *Leo* 3. conſult his own, or his predeceſſors honour, who diſſwaded the *Legats* of the Council at *Aquiſgrane*, from continuing in the *Creed* that Addition of *Filioque*: for, when after a great deal of diſcourſe concerning the Article and the Addition; the *Legats* at laſt tell him, *That they perceived, his pleaſure was, that it ſhould be taken out of the Creed, and ſo every one left to his liberty. His anſwer is, So it is certainly determined by me, and I would perſwade you by all means to aſſent to it*: And, to manifeſt this to be his conſtant judgement, he cauſed the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed, without the Addition of* Filioque *to be inſcribed in a greater ſilver Table, and placed publickly in the Church, to be read of all, as appears by the teſtimony of* Photius, *and* Peter Lombard, *that ſo all, both Greeks and Latins, might ſee, that nothing was added to the Creed.* Had not this now been a ſtrange action of his, if this Addition had been ſo long before in the time of *Damaſus*? Nothing then can be more evident, than that in this *Leo's time*, no ſuch Addition was made to the *Creed*: Therefore, it ſeems moſt probable, which the famous *Antoninus* delivers, that this Addition was made by *Pope Nicolaus* 1. For, when he relates the cauſes, why *Photius* excommunicated him, he mentions that in the firſt place, *That he had made an Addition to the Creed, by making the Spirit to proceed from the Son; and therefore had fallen under the ſentence of the third Oecumenical Council, which prohibited ſuch Additions to be made.* To which *P. Pithæus* ſubſcribes likewiſe, and *Petavius* ſeems not to diſſent; the only thing which is pretended againſt it, is, that *Andreas Coloſſenſis* in the *Council* at *Ferrara*, ſaith, That though *Photius* was a known and bitter enemy of the *Latin Church*, yet he never objected this Addition againſt *Nicolaus* or *Adrian*; but how ſtrangely overſeen *Andreas* was in theſe words, ſufficiently appears by *Photius* his *Encyclical Epiſtle*, wherein he doth in terms object this againſt the *Latins*, as appears by the words already produced. So that although you would willingly have ſet this addition far enough off from the *Schiſm*, yet you ſee how improbable a fiction you produce for it; and withal you ſee, that this *Addition* by the conſent of your own moſt learned and impartial Writers, falls juſt upon the time when the *Schiſm* broke out, *viz.* in the time of *Nicolaus* and *Photius*; and therefore now judge you, whether theſe words were ſo long added before the *Schiſm*, that they could give no occaſion to it.

Ita protuldubio à noſtra parte decernitur; ità quoque, ut à veſtra aſſentiatur, à nobis omnimodis ſuadetur. Apud Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. Tom. 2. p. 256.

Baron. Annal. ad An. 809.

Phot. in ep. ad Patriarch. Aquileienſ. Pet. Lombard. lib. 1. ſent. diſt. 11.

Tunc inter alias accuſationes hoc principaliter poſuit, Ipſum fore excommunicatum, quod appoſuerat ad ſymbolum, Sp. Sanctum à filio procedere. Similiter & depoſitum, quod ipſe Nicolaus Papa incidiſſet in ſententiam tertii Concilii. Anton. Part. 3. Tit. 22. c. 13. ſect. 10.

Concil. Florent. ſeſſ. 8.

§. 19. 2. The next thing to be conſidered, is, *Whether they, who added it, had power ſo to do?* Two things the *Greeks* inſiſt on, to ſhew, that it was not done by ſufficient authority. 1. *Becauſe all ſuch Additions were directly prohibited by the Epheſine Council.* 2. *That ſuppoſing them not prohibited, yet the Pope had no power to add to the Creed without the conſent of the Eaſtern Churches.*

1. *That ſuch Additions were ſeverely prohibited by the Epheſine Council*: the Sanction of which *Council* to this purpoſe hath been already produced, and is extant both in the *Acts* of the *Epheſine* and *Florentine Councils*, in which latter it is inſiſted on as the *Foundation* of the *Greeks Arguments* againſt the Addition of *Filioque*, by *Marcus Epheſius*; and the reaſon he there gives of ſuch a Sanction made by the *Council* at *Epheſus*, is, that after the *Nicene Council*, in ſeveral *Provincial Councils*, there were above *thirty ſeveral Expoſitions* made of the *Nicene Creed*; upon which, the *ſecond Oecumenical Council* made a further explication of it, explaining thoſe things which belonged to the *Divinity* of the *Spirit*, and the *Incarnation*

Concil. Epheſ. part. 2. *Act.* 6. *p.* 366. *Concil. Florent. ſeſſ.* 5. *p.* 587.

of

of Chriſt; and, becauſe they did not prohibit any Additions, the *Neſtorians* eaſily depraved the *Nicene Creed*, inſerting their own opinions into it (as appears by the confeſſion of Faith exhibited to the *Council* by *Chariſius*) which being read in the *Council*, and the *Fathers* thereby underſtanding how eaſily, after this rate, *New Creeds* might be continually made in the *Church*, they ſeverely prohibited any further Additions to be made to the *Creed*. And therefore, although they decreed in that *Council* the *Virgin Mary* to be θεοτόκος, in oppoſition to *Neſtorius*; yet, they never offered to inſert it into the *Creed*, although they apprehended it neceſſary to explain the *Oeconomy* of our *Saviour's Incarnation*. And that which much confirms the meaning of the Decree, to be the abſolute prohibition of all kind of Additions to the *Creed*, is, the *Epiſtle of S. Cyril* of *Alexandria* to *Johannes Antiochenus*; wherein reciting this decree of the *Council* he adds theſe words as the explication of it. *We neither permit our ſelves or others to change one word or ſyllable of what is herein contained* (ſpeaking of the *Nicene Creed*) which Epiſtle was read and approved in the *fourth Oecumenical Council*. To this the *Latins* anſwered them, that which is ſtill anſwered in the ſame caſe, *viz. That this Article of Filioque was only declaration, and not a prohibited Addition*: But the *Greeks* ſay, this anſwer is unſatisfactory on theſe accounts. 1. Becauſe there is no reaſon to ſay, that Decree doth not forbid the inſerting *Declarations* into the *Creed*. 2. That if it did not forbid that, yet there is as little reaſon to ſay, this was a meer Declaration. 1. Becauſe there is no reaſon to ſay, that the *Council* did not forbid the inſerting Declarations into the *Creed*: For, as *Beſſarion* well obſerves, it never was lawful to add new and diſtinct Articles of *Faith*, from thoſe which are contained in Scripture, but the *Church* only undertook the explication and declaration of the things therein contained; and this was only lawful. Therefore the *Ancient Fathers* had full liberty of explaining Articles of Faith, and uſing thoſe explications, as they judged moſt expedient, and to place them where they thought good, ſo it were not in *Scripture*: thence they might inſert them into the *Creed*, or elſewhere. But afterwards (*i. e.* after this decree of the *Epheſine Council*) this liberty was partly taken away, and partly continued. For, it never was, or will be, unlawful to explain or declare Articles of Faith; but to inſert thoſe explications into the *Creed*, is now unlawful, becauſe forbidden by the decree of a *General Council*. For, ſaith he, the *Fathers* of the *third Council*, obſerving what great inconveniencies had followed in the *Church*, upon the inlargement of *Creeds*, and that no injury could at all come by the prohibition of any further Additions to be inſerted (for by that means they ſhould only be bound to believe no more than what thoſe *Holy Fathers* believed; and who dare charge their Faith with imperfection) and they did therefore wiſely forbid all other expoſitions of Faith to be inſerted into the *Creed*, as he there at large proves. And in the progreſs of that diſcourſe, takes off that which *Bellarmin* looked on as the only ſatisfactory anſwer, *viz. That the prohibition concerned only private perſons*; For, ſaith he, it cannot be conceived, that the *Council* ſhould take care about the Declarations of the *Creed*, made by particular perſons (whereas it always was, and is lawful for ſuch to declare their Faith more particularly, as appears by the *Creed* of *Chariſius*, received in this *Council*) but this they looked after, that the *Creed*, which was commonly received in the *Chriſtian Churches*, and into which men are baptized, ſhould receive no alteration at all. And to ſhew what their meaning was, though their *Council* was purpoſely aſſembled againſt *Neſtorius*, yet they would not inſert Θεοτόκος into the *Creed*. And the ſame decree was obſerved in the 4, 5, 6, 7. *Councils*; which, by their actions, did declare this to be the meaning of the *Epheſine Council*,

ὅτε μὴν ὀπτρέπομεν ἑαυτοῖς, ἢ ἑτέροις ἢ λέξιν ἀμεῖψαι ἢ ἐγκειμένων ἐκείσε, ἢ μίαν γὰρ παραβῆναι συλλαβήν. p. 589. Seſſ. 5.

Concil. Florent. ſeſſ. 8. p. 626.

Council, that no Declarations whatſoever, ſhould hereafter be inſerted into the *Creed*. For, if they were meer Declarations, there was much leſs neceſſity of inſerting them into the *Creed*, which was ſuppoſed to be a Syſteme of the neceſſary Articles of Faith.

2. *There was as little reaſon to ſay, that this Article was a meer Declaration.* For, the *Latins* pretended, that the Article of *Filioque*, was only a further explication of that *ex Patre*. For, if ſo, then whoſoever doth believe the Proceſſion from the *Father*, doth believe all that is neceſſary to be believed: And therefore certainly it can be no Hereſie not to believe the Proceſſion from the Son, becauſe that is only ſuppoſed to be a Declaration of that from the Father. And ſince you are ſo ready to charge the *Greek Church* with *Hereſie*, I pray tell us whether this Article be a Declaration or not: If not, then the *Latins* were all deceived, who pleaded the lawfulneſs of inſerting *Filioque* on that account; and conſequently it muſt be a prohibited Addition; If it be, then ſhew us what Hereſie lyes in not acknowledging a meer explication, when all that is ſuppoſed neceſſary is believed in the ſubſtance of the Article. Moreover, *Beſſarion* rightly diſtinguiſheth
P. 625. between an explication, ἀπ' ἐγκειμένων, from ἐν τῷ ἐγκειμένῳ, and therefore grants that the *Filioque* might be ſaid to be an explication *of ſomething* contained in the *Creed*, but not *out of any thing* contained in the *Creed*; and therefore the *Medium* being *extrinſecal*, it could not be ſaid to be a meer Declaration. For, there can be no neceſſary Argument drawn from the Proceſſion from the Father, to infer the Proceſſion from the Son; but it muſt be proved from ſome extrinſecal diſtinct argument.

§. 20. 2. *Suppoſe this to be no prohibited Addition, yet what right had the Pope and his Council, without the conſent of the Eaſtern Churches, to make this Addition to the Creed?* For, the *Greeks* ſaid, whatever authority the *Church* of *Rome* had, it received by the *Canons*, and its authority was therefore leſs than that of an *Oecumenical Council*, wherefore it could not juſtly repeal, or act contrary to the decree of a *General Council*, as it did apparently in this caſe. By which means the *Latins* were driven off from thoſe which they looked on as ſlighter velitations, and took *Sanctuary* in the *Plenitude of the Pope's Power*, that therefore no *Council* could preſcribe to him; there could be no neceſſity of his calling the *Eaſtern Churches* to debate this *Addition*, for he could do it of himſelf, by virtue of his own authority in and over the Church. Here *Anſelm* and *Bonaventure* think to ſecure themſelves, and hither they are all driven at laſt. So that we plainly ſee, whatever elſe is pretended, *the Pope's uſurped Power* was that which truly gave occaſion to the *Schiſm*: For, it was not the *Latins* believing the Proceſſion from the Son, which made the ſeparation between the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, but the *Pope's pretending a Power to impoſe an Article of Faith in the Creed againſt the decree of a former, and without the conſent of a preſent Oecumenical Council.* If you pretend, that there hath been ſince an *Oecumenical Council* at *Florence*, which hath declared it; by that very anſwer you juſtifie the *Greeks* before that *Council*, and ſo lay the guilt of the *Schiſm* wholly on the *Pope*, who did inſert and impoſe this Article, before an *Oecumenical Council*. Thus ſtill it appears, the cauſe of the *Schiſm* began at *Rome*; and by the ſame argument with which you charge them with Hereſie, *viz.* the *Council* at *Florence*, you vindicate the *Greek Church* from *Schiſm*, in all the actions of it before that *Council*.

And this might ſuffice to ſhew, that it was not *the levity, vanity, or ambition of the Greeks, which gave the great occaſion of the Schiſm, but the Pride, Incroachments, and Uſurpations of the Church of* Rome, as might largely be manifeſted from the hiſtory of thoſe times, when the *Schiſm* began. The riſe of which ought to be derived from the times of the *Conſtantinopolitan*, and *Chalcedon Councils*; the *ſecond* and *fourth Oecumenical*. For, the *Canons* of thoſe

Councils

Councils decreeing equal Priviledges to Conſtantinople, *with thoſe of* Rome, *made the Popes have a continual jealouſie upon the Greek Church*, and watch all opportunities to diſgrace it, and infringe the liberties of it. Thence came the rage of *Leo* againſt *Anatolius* the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, in the time of *Martianus*; thence the feud between *Simplicius* and *Felix* 3. of *Rome*, and *Acacius* of *Conſtantinople*, for defending the Priviledges of his *See*, in oppoſition to the *Pope's*; inſomuch that *Felix* fairly excommunicates him, becauſe he would not ſubmit to the *Pope*'s tryal in the caſe of the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*; which continued ſo long, that *Euphemius*, who ſucceeded *Acacius*, though he excommunicated *Petrus Moggus* of *Alexandria*, yet could not be received into the Communion of the *Roman Church* by *Felix*, becauſe he would not expunge the name of *Acacius* out of the *Diptychs* of the *Church*; and afterwards *Gelaſius* refuſed it on the ſame grounds; which *Euphemius* ſtill denying to do, the Schiſm continued. And, although afterwards the *Emperour Anaſtaſius*, and the *Greek Church*, deſired the making up of this difference; yet no other terms of communion would be accepted by *Hormiſdas*, without the expunging the name of *Acacius*. So implacably were they bent againſt the very memory of *Acacius*, for defending the *Priviledge* of his *See*, that they would rather continue that lamentable *Schiſm*, than not avenge themſelves upon him; and conſequently, make all future *Patriarchs* fearful of oppoſing the *Pope's Authority*. If we look yet further, we ſhall ſtill find the ambition of the *Popes* to have cauſed all the diſturbance in the *Greek Churches*, although ſome of the *Patriarchs* of *Conſtantinople* cannot be excuſed from the ſame faults. In the time of the *ſecond Council* at *Nice*, *Pope Adrian* not only contends for the enlargement of his Juriſdiction, but threatens to pronounce them *Hereticks*, who did not conſent to it, which makes *Petrus de Marca* ſay, *That he ſuppoſeth* [*that*] *the firſt time ever any were charged with Hereſie on ſuch an account*. The ſame pretence we ſtill find in all the *Schiſms* which ever happened, as that in the time of *Photius*, that afterward, in the time of *Michael Cerularius*, and in the ſucceſſive ages, ſtill the terms of communion were, Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome*, and acknowledging the ſupremacy of that *See*, which the *Greeks* did then, and do ſtill conſtantly deny; ſo that it was not the *Greeks Levity*, but the *Romaniſts* ambition and uſurpation which gave occaſion to that fearful *Schiſm*.

Petrus de Marca, de Concord. Sacerd. & Imp. l. 1. c. 1. ſect. 5.

But for all this, *It muſt ſtill be lawful for your Church to add, and Anathematize too*: which his Lordſhip thought a little unreaſonable, but it ſeems you do not: For, ſay you, *The Church did rightly Anathematize all ſuch denyers*; why ſo, *Becauſe the meaning of the Latin Church being underſtood by the Addition of Filioque, and that whoſoever denyed, muſt be ſuppoſed to deny the Proceſſion, then it became Hereſie to deny it, and the Church did rightly Anathematize all ſuch denyers*. So you ſay indeed; but, you would do well 1. To ſhew, that the underſtanding the meaning of the *Latin Church*, is ſufficient to make the denyers of what ſhe affirms, to be *Hereticks*. 2. How any one that denies the *Filioque* muſt be ſuppoſed to deny the Proceſſion. If you mean the Proceſſion *à Filio*, you ſpeak very *wiſely*, but prove nothing; for ſome might grant the Proceſſion, and yet deny the lawfulneſs of your *Churches* adding to the *Creed*. 3. All this while we are to ſeek how the *Latin Church* can make any thing to be a *Hereſie*, which was not ſo before. And therefore if your *Anathema's* have no better grounds, the *Greeks* need not much fear the effects of them. That *your Church on any occaſion is apt enough to ſpeak loud words*, we may very eaſily believe, but whether ſhe had juſt cauſe to ſpeak ſo big in this cauſe, is the thing in queſtion, and we have already manifeſted the contrary.

§. 21.

His Lordſhip ſays, *It ought to be no eaſie thing, to condemn a man of Hereſie in foundation of Faith; much leſs a Church; leaſt of all, ſo ample and large a Church*

P. 26. n. 3.

as

as the Greek, *especially so as to make them no Church. Heaven Gates were not so easily shut against multitudes, when S.* Peter *wore the Keys at his own Girdle.*

P. 12. To this you answer; *Neither is the Roman-Catholick Church justly accusable of cruelty (though the Bishop taxes her of it) because she is quick and sharp against those that fall into Heresie.* But, if she hath power to pronounce whom she please *Hereticks*, and on what account she please (as *Hadrian* I. in case of his *Patrimony*) and then it be commendable in her to deal with them as *Hereticks*, it must needs be dangerous opposing her in any thing, for such who dread her *Anathema's*. But his Lordship was not speaking of what was to be done, in case of notorious Heresie, but what tenderness ought to be used in condemning men for *Heresie*; and much more in condemning whole *Churches* for it, on such slender accounts as you do the *Greek Church*. You should shew, When S. *Peter*, or any of the *Apostles* did exclude *Churches* from communion, for denying such *Articles* as that you charge the *Greek Church* with. And it would be worth your *enquiry*, why those in the *Corinthian Church*, who at least questioned the *Resurrection*; those in the *Galatian and other Churches*, who asserted the *Necessity of the Ceremonial Law under the Gospel*, both which *errours* are by the *Apostle* said to be of so dangerous a nature; are not *Anathematized* presently by the *Apostle*, and thrown out of the *Church*, at least, *to prevent the infection of other Christians, if not for the good of the Libertine Hereticks*, as you speak. Your mentioning S. *Peters proceeding with Ananias* and *Sapphira*, must be acknowledged a very fit resemblance for your Churches dealing with *Hereticks*; only they whom you are pleased to account *Hereticks*, have cause to rejoyce, that since your Churches good will is so much discovered, she hath not the same *miraculous Power*: For, then she would be sure to have few left to oppose her. But do you really think, *Ananias* and *Sapphira's* fault was no greater than that of the *Greek Church*, that you produce this instance? and, do you think the Church enjoys still the same power over offenders, which S. *Peter* then had? If not, to what purpose do you mention such things here; unless to let us see, that it is want of something else besides will, which makes you suffer any whom you call *Hereticks* to live. That S. *Paul* chastised his untoward *Children*, indeed you tell us, from 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. but if you bring this to any purpose, you must make the *Greeks Errour*, as bad as *Incest*, or a *denying the Faith*; and when you have done so, you may hear of a further answer. On what account *your Church punisheth Delinquents*, will be then necessary to be shewed, when you have a little further cleared what *Power* your Church hath to make *Delinquents* in such cases as you condemn the *Greek Church* for. But, as long as your Church is Accuser, Witness, and Judge too, you must never expect that your *Anathema's* will be accounted any other than *bruta fulmina*, noise and no more.

CHAP.

CHAP. 2.

Of Fundamentals in General.

The Popiſh Tenet concerning Fundamentals, a meer ſtep to the Roman *Greatneſs. The Queſtion about Fundamentals ſtated. An enquiry into the nature of them. What are Fundamentals, in order to particular perſons; and what to be owned as ſuch, in order to Eccleſiaſtical Communion. The Prudence and Moderation of the Church of* England, *in defining Articles of Faith. What judged Fundamental by the Catholick Church. No new Articles of Faith can become neceſſary. The Churches Power in propounding matters of Faith, examined. What is a ſufficient Propoſition. Of the Athanaſian Creed, and its being owned by the Church of* England. *In what ſenſe the Articles of it are neceſſary to Salvation. Of the diſtinction of the material and formal object of Faith, as to Fundamentals. His Lordſhips integrity, and* T. C.'s *forgery, in the teſtimony of* Scotus. *Of Hereſie, and how far the Church may declare matters of Faith. The teſtimony of S.* Auguſtine *vindicated.*

§. 1. THe *Greek Church* appearing not guilty of *Hereſie*, by any evidence of *Scripture*, Reaſon, or the Conſent of the Primitive Church, nothing is left to make good the charge, but that the *Church of Rome* hath defin'd it to be ſo; which Pretence, at firſt view, carrying the greateſt partiality and unreaſonableneſs in it, great care is taken, that the partiality be not diſcovered, by not openly mentioning the *Church* of *Rome*, but the *Church in General* (as though it were impoſſible to conceive any other *Church* but that at *Rome*) and for the unreaſonableneſs of it, it muſt be confidently aſſerted, *That all points defin'd by the Church are Fundamental*: So to be ſure the *Greek Church* will never eſcape the charge of *Hereſie*. For this end, *Mr. Fiſher in the Conference acknowledgeth, that when his Lordſhip had denyed the errour of the Greek Church to be Fundamental, he was forced to repeat what he had formerly brought againſt Dr.* White, *concerning Points Fundamental.* The reaſon of which was, that, eaſily perceiving that it was impoſſible to ſtand their ground in their charge on the *Greek Church* upon other terms, he is forced to take *Sanctuary* in the *Churches Definition*; and if that will not make it good, there is nothing elſe remaining to do it. And this is the cauſe of the following *Diſpute concerning Fundamentals*; wherein the main thing undertaken, is, the proof, that the formal reaſon of *Fundamentals* is to be taken from the *Definition of the preſent Church*; but, as this muſt be confeſſed to be the main Fundamental of the *Church* of *Rome*, (for which yet the thing being manifeſt, no *Definition* of that *Church* is neceſſary;) ſo withal, I doubt not, but it will be made evident in the progreſs of this diſcourſe, that never was there any pretence more partial, abſurd, and tyrannical than this is. Which his Lordſhip takes notice of in theſe words, which deſerve a repetition; *It was not the leaſt means by which* Rome *grew to her Greatneſs, to blaſt every oppoſer ſhe had with the name of Heretick or Schiſmatick; for this ſerved to ſhrivel the credit of the perſons. And the perſons once brought into Contempt and Ignominy, all the good they deſired in the Church, fell to duſt, for want of creditable perſons to back and ſupport it. To make this proceeding good, in theſe latter years, this courſe, it ſeems, was taken. The School that muſt maintain (and ſo they do) that all Points defin'd by the Church, are thereby Fundamental, neceſſary to be believed, of the ſubſtance of Faith; and that, though it be determined quite* extra Scripturam. *And then leave the wiſe and active Heads to take order, that there be ſtrength enough ready* P. 27. ſect. 16. n. 2.

to determine what is fitteſt for them. To this you anſwer, with an ὦ καταίρατε! You call it *a Squib, a Fancy, a weak Diſcourſe, one of the Biſhops Railleries*, and what not. It ſeems it pinched you hard, you cry out ſo Tragically. But it is very certain, you are more impatient to have your Politicks, than your Errours diſcovered; and if you have any Curſes more dreadful than others, they are ſure to light on thoſe who diſcover the intrigues of your Deſigns. For if once men come to diſcern how much more of Artifice and cunning, than of Truth and Religion, there is in the managing the Intereſt of your Church, they would not eaſily think, the way to Heaven can lye among ſo many foldings of the old Serpent. And this is not to think as you tragically ſpeak, *That all the world is turn'd mad or Heathen*: for, thanks be to God, as *Catholique* as your Church is, it muſt be a huge *Catachreſis* to take it for all the world: neither do we think your Church mad, but very wiſe and *Politick* in theſe pretences; and that ſtill you are reſolved to ſhew, that though other *Churches* may be more *Children of light than yours* (ignorance being ſo much in favour with you) yet *yours is wiſer in its Generation.* But how the pretending of your Church to Infallibility, and power to define Fundamentals, ſhould make us imagine *all the world Heathen*, is not eaſie to conceive, unleſs you are conſcious to your ſelf, that ſuch pretences as theſe are, are the way to make it ſo. But we muſt ſee ſtill how your *Cothurnus* fits you. *No truth left upon earth, but all become Juglers?* See what it is to be true Catholiques, that if they juggle, all the world muſt do ſo too; as though *totus mundus exercet hiſtrioniam*, were *Latin* for the *Infallibility of the Church* of Rome. But have you indeed ſuch a *Monopoly* of Truth, that if your party prove Juglers, there will be no truth left upon earth? if you had ſaid, none unſophiſticated, yet even that had been a great *Truth* left upon earth ſtill. But I ſhall cut you ſhort in what follows of your Declamation, by telling you, that though your Harangue were ten times longer than it is, and your exclamations louder, and your Authorities better than of *your Prelates, Miracles, Doctors, Heads of Schools, auſtere and religious perſons* (in Engliſh Monks and Friers) yet all theſe would not one jot perſwade us contrary to common ſenſe, and the large experience of the world, That *Religion* is not made by you an Inſtrument to advance the *Pope's Ambition*, and that the *Church* is but a more plauſible name, whereby to maintain the *Court of Rome.* And we need not go from our preſent ſubject, for a proof of it. I will not charge this upon all perſons of your Communion, for all of them do not believe the State-principles of your Church; and others are kept, as much as may be, from all ways of diſcovering the great deſigns of it; and therefore there may be ſo much innocency and ſimplicity in ſome, as may keep them from *proſtituting their Salvation to the Pope's Greatneſs*: but this is no plea on behalf of thoſe who have the managery of thoſe deſigns; who if they do not ſee what things are fitteſt for the *Pope*'s temporal ends, will not long be thought fit for their employment. But, is it not palpable how much you endeavour to ſhrivel Chriſtianity into a Party and Faction, excluding all others that are not of your party out of the Church, and conſequently from hopes of ſalvation, though never ſo pious and conſcientious? Are not the far greateſt part of the opinions you contend for, againſt all the reſt of the Chriſtian world, ſuch as are manifeſtly ſubſervient to temporal ends? And are not ſuch more zealouſly diſputed for, than the plain Articles of Faith, and the indiſpenſable precepts of the Chriſtian Religion? Have you not found out all the Artifices imaginable, to enervate the force of Chriſtian Piety, by your Doctrines about *Repentance, Prayer, Indulgences, Probability, Purgatory*, and ſuch like? And inſtead of thoſe rational acts of *Devotion*, which our *Religion* requires from us, have made choice of ſuch fond, ludicrous,

P. 13. n. 1.

unin-

unintelligible pieces of Devotion, (by the moſt who are concerned in them) as though you were reſolved to ſee how much it was poſſible to *debauch Chriſtianity*, and make it contemptible in the world? Add to theſe the Arts you have to violate Humane Societies, by diſpenſing with Oaths, breaking Faith, diſſolving Obedience to Civil Authority, when it oppoſeth your deſigns; and is it poſſible then for perſons not blind-folded with the groſſeſt ſort of implicit Faith, to judg otherwiſe, but the deſign of your Church is to determine, *not what is trueſt, but what is fitteſt for your ends*? And, although you ſcurrilouſly call his Lordſhip's diſcourſe, *ſtuff that might ſerve ſometimes for Pulpit-babble, to deceive the giddy multitude, and caſt a miſt before their eyes*; yet you ſee, he was not afraid of what any adverſary could ſay againſt it, by writing it in a Polemical Diſcourſe, in which we could be glad to ſee ſome of thoſe famous *Legends*, and Seraphical Notions, which your Pulpit-entertainments conſiſt ſo much of, eſpecially where you are out of the reach of Hereticks, and then we ſhould judge which looks more like babling, and deceiving the giddy multitude. But, to let us ſee what men of reach and Politicians you are, you have found out a ſtrange *Fetch* in his Lordſhips diſcourſe, *viz.* that all this is, *That they might not ſee* P. 13. *the impurity of their own Engliſh-Proteſtant Church, even in its firſt riſe under* Henry *the eighth, and the people-cheating Policies it was beholding to for its reſtauration under* Queen Elizabeth, *as may be ſeen in Hiſtory*. Hiſtory is a large *wood* to bid us ſeek for theſe cheating *Policies* in; and if you had any other deſign, but meerly to ſhew your ſelf a *Politician* in this, that you can *fortiter calumniari, uſe your tongue manfully when reproaches are uſeful*; you would have produced ſome evidence ſo clear of them, as his Lordſhip here inſiſts on in reference to your Church. But, as long as you converſe only in *Generals*, you will give us leave to think who thoſe are which uſe to do ſo, *viz. ſuch grand Politicians* as your ſelf. For the Particulars of our Reformation, we ſhall have occaſion to vindicate them in another place, and therein ſhall eaſily manifeſt what an *Itch* you had to calumniate here, though you were ſure to *ſmart* for it afterwards. That which you call weakneſs of judgement, or want of Charity in his Lordſhip, will be found to lye at another door, by our making it appear, that what you call a groundleſs and impoſſible ſlander, is a real and undoubted truth. But when you tell us, P. 14. That *ſuch Railleries do not become one that would be eſteemed a grave Doctor of the Engliſh Church*, an alterius orbis Patriarcha, *as the ancient Primates of* England *have been call'd*: I know not whether you diſcover more judgment or reading in it; *your judgment* in calling that an unbecoming *Raillery*, which is a great and ſeaſonable Truth; *your reading*, in miſtaking *Patriarcha* for *Papa*, or elſe you were willing to diſſemble it, becauſe then by the advantage of his *title*, he might be fitter to diſcover the Artifices and Deſigns of his *Fellow-Pope*. The laying open of which is certainly vaſtly different from *ſporting with all that can be ſerious on earth* (*man's ſalvation*) as you moſt injuriouſly calumniate his Lordſhip in your next words, in affirming ſo of him, when his only deſign was, to clear the way to mans ſalvation, by diſcovering the gins and traps which are laid in the way of ſilly men, by the pernicious ſubtilty of thoſe of your party.

The way being thus cleared, we come to the main queſtion, *viz. Whether all Points, defined by the Church, are Fundamental*; and here, becauſe §. 2. you tell us, *His Lordſhip is like one* that provides for a *retreat or a ſubterfuge, by cutting out a number of ambiguous diſtinctions*; you give us fair hopes what clear proceedings we may expect from you, who abhor as much the clear ſtating of a queſtion, as *Foxes* do running in beaten Roads. But, as well as you love *them*, you muſt be drawn out of your *Holes*, which will be much for the advantage of Truth, though very little for yours.

To come therefore close to the business, that you may not think I seek subterfuges, or retreats, I shall wave all other acceptions of *Fundamentals*, and take the Question in your own sense, that is, *for Points necessary to Salvation.* The Question then in controversie between us, is this, *Whether the ground or reason why any thing is fundamental or necessary to salvation, be, because it is defined by the Church to be so*, and consequently, *Whether all Points, defined by the Church, be not fundamental or necessary to Salvation?* For the occasion of this Controversie was from the *Greek Church*, whether her errour, as to the Procession from the *Son*, be fundamental or no, *i. e.* such as excludes her from being a *Church*, and consequently from Salvation. The ground of your affirmation, is, because *the Church hath defined it to be so*; so that the ground and reason why any thing is supposed fundamental or necessary to Salvation, must be the Definition of the Church: But for our
P. 15. better understanding your meaning, *you distinguish of two ways, whereby Points may be necessary to Salvation; the one absolutely, by reason of the matter they contain; which,* say you, *is so fundamentally necessary in it self, that not only the disbelief of it, when propounded by the Church, but the meer want of an express knowledge, and belief of it, will hinder Salvation; and those are such Points, without the express belief whereof, no man can be saved, which Divines call necessary* necessitate medii; *others of this kind they call necessary* necessitate præcepti, *which all men are commanded to seek after, and expresly believe; so that a culpable Ignorance of them hinders Salvation, although some may be saved with invincible Ignorance of them. And all these are absolutely necessary to be expresly believed, either* necessitate præcepti, *or* medii, *in regard of the matter which they contain. But the rest of the Points of Faith are necessary to be believed* necessitate præcepti, *only conditionally, that is, to all such to whom they are sufficiently propounded, as defined by the Church: which necessity proceeds not precisely from the material object, or matter contained in them; but from the formal object of Divine authority, declared to Christians by the Churches Definition. Whether therefore the Points in question be necessary in the first manner or no, by reason of their precise matter; yet if they be necessary, by reason of the Divine Authority, or Formal object of Divine Revelation, sufficiently declared and propounded to us, they will be points Fundamental, that is, necessary to salvation to be believed, as we have shewed Fundamental must here be taken.* These words of yours containing the full state of the question in your own terms, and being the substance of all you say on this Controversie, I have recited at large; that you may not complain, your meaning is mistaken in them. You assert then, that besides that *necessity* which ariseth from the *matter* of things to be believed, and from the absolute *Command* of God; there is another necessity *conditionally* upon the *Churches Definition*, but, supposing that *Definition*, the thing so propounded becomes as necessary to Salvation, as what is necessary from the matter; for in all hypothetical propositions, the supposition being in act, the matter becomes necessary. For, unless you speak of such a necessity, as becomes as universally obligatory, on supposition of the Churches Definition, as that which ariseth from the matter, or absolute command; you are guilty of the greatest tergiversation, and perverting the state of the Question. For, otherwise that cannot be said to be fundamental or necessary to Salvation, in the sense of this Question, which is not generally necessary to Salvation to all Christians. For no man was ever so silly, as to imagine, that the Question of *Fundamentals*, with respect to whole *Churches*, as it is here taken, can be understood in any other sense, than as the matter, call'd *Fundamental* or *Necessary*, must be equally fundamental and necessary to all persons. And that this must be your meaning, appears by the rise of the Controversie, which concerns the whole *Greek Church*, which you exclude from being a *Church*, because

she

ſhe errs fundamentally, and that ſhe errs fundamentally, becauſe the *Church* hath defined it to be an errour. So that what the *Church* determines as matter of Faith, is as neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation, as that which is neceſſary from the matter, or from an abſolute Command. For, otherwiſe the *Greek Church* might not be in a *Fundamental Errour*, notwithſtanding the *Churches Definition*: the ground of this *Errour* being *Fundamental*, not being derived from the matter, or abſolute Command, but from the *Churches Definition*. If therefore the denial of what the Church defines, doth exclude from Salvation; the neceſſity and obligation muſt be equal to that which ariſeth from the matter to be believed. And if the Church defines any particulars to be explicitly believed as neceſſary to Salvation, not only the *not disbelieving* them, but the *not explicit believing them*, will be as deſtructive to Salvation, as if the matter of the things themſelves were neceſſary; or that it were abſolutely commanded; for in thoſe caſes you ſay, the not explicit believing is that which damns, and ſo on your principles it will do here, when the explicit belief is the thing defined by the Church. This will be more plain by an Inſtance. It is notoriouſly known, that at the ſhutting up of the *Council* of *Trent*, a *Confeſſion of Faith* was drawn up, and confirmed by the *Bull* of *Pius* 4. *A. D.* 1564. and that, *ut unius & ejuſdem fidei profeſſio uniformiter ab omnibus exhibeatur, That the Profeſſion of one and the ſame Faith, may be made known to all, and declared uniformly by all.* In which Confeſſion, after the enumeration of the *Articles* contained in the *Ancient Creed*; there are many others added concerning *Traditions*, *Seven Sacraments*, the *Decrees of the Council of* Trent, *as to Original ſin and juſtification*; *The Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Communion in one kind*, *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Worſhip of Images*, *Indulgences*, *the Popes Supremacy*, &c. All which are required to be believed with an equal aſſent to the former, as *abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation*, and neceſſary Conditions of *Catholick Communion*. For thus it ends; *Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt, quam in preſenti ſponte profiteor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & inviolatam uſque ad extremum vitæ ſpiritum, &c. This true Catholick Faith, without which none can be ſaved, which at preſent I profeſs, and truly hold, and will do whole and undefiled to my lives end, &c.* Judge you now, whether an equal explicit Faith be not here required to the Definitions of the Church, as to the Articles of the Creed; and if ſo, there muſt be an equal neceſſity, in order to Salvation, of believing both of them, it being here ſo expreſly declared, that theſe Definitions are *Integral Parts* of that *Catholick Faith*, without which there is *no Salvation*. And what could be more ſaid of thoſe things, whoſe matter or abſolute precept do make them neceſſary? This Confeſſion of Faith therefore gives us the trueſt ſtate of the preſent Queſtion, in theſe particulars. 1. That the *Definitions* of the Church are to be believed, to be as neceſſary to Salvation, as the Articles of the *Ancient Creed*, without the belief of which no Salvation is to be expected. 2. That the *explicit Belief* of theſe Definitions as neceſſary to Salvation, may be required in order to *Catholick Communion*, and that they are to be believed of all as ſuch, *becauſe* they are defined by the *Church*. So that the Queſtion is not, *What is ſo required by the Churches Definition, declared and propounded to us, that it ought not to be diſ-believed without mortal and damnable ſin, which unrepented deſtroyes Salvation*, as you ſtated it; for this ſeems only to reſpect the Faith of particular perſons, who are to believe according as the *Propoſition* may be judged *ſufficient*: but the true ſtate of the Queſtion, is, Whether any *Definitions* of the *Church* may be believed as *Neceſſary Articles of Faith*; and whether *they may be impoſed on others to be believed as ſuch*, ſo that they may be excluded *Catholick*

lick Communion if they do not. For this is really the true ſtate of the Queſtion, between your Church, and ours, ever ſince the *Council* of *Trent*; and as to it thus ſtated (as it ought to be) I do moſt readily joyn iſſue with you.

§. 3. For the clearing of which important *Queſtion*, on which the main cauſe of our being ſeparated from your Communion depends, theſe three things will be neceſſary to be exactly diſcuſſed. 1. *What the Grounds are on which any thing doth become neceſſary to Salvation?* 2. *Whether any thing, whoſe matter is not neceſſary, and is not required by an abſolute Command, can by any means whatſoever afterwards become neceſſary?* 3. *Whether the Church hath power by any Propoſition or Definition to make any thing become neceſſary to Salvation, and to be believed as ſuch, which was not ſo before?* Theſe three I ſuppoſe you cannot deny but will take in all that is conſiderable in this Controverſie. Which I ſhall with the more care examine, becauſe nothing tends more to the peace of the Chriſtian World, than a through and clear diſcuſſion of it; and nothing cauſeth more the *Schiſms* and *Diviſions* of it, than the want of a right and due conception of it.

1. *What the Grounds are on which any thing doth become neceſſary to Salvation?* For our better underſtanding of which, we muſt conſider two things. 1. *What things are neceſſary to the Salvation of men as ſuch, or conſidered in their ſingle and private capacities?* 2. *What things are neceſſary to be owned in order to Salvation, by Chriſtian Societies, or as the bonds and conditions of Eccleſiaſtical Communion?* The want of underſtanding this diſtinction of the neceſſity of things, hath cauſed moſt of the perplexities and confuſion in this Controverſie of *Fundamentals*.

1. *What thoſe things are which are neceſſary to the Salvation of particular perſons?* But that we may make all as clear as poſſible, in a matter of ſo great intricacy, two things again muſt be inquired into. 1. *What the Ground is, why any thing becomes neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation?* 2. *What the Meaſure and Extent is of thoſe things which are to be believed by particular perſons as neceſſary to Salvation?*

1. *What the Ground or Foundation is, on which things become neceſſary to be believed by particular perſons?* And that which is the true ground of the neceſſity, why any thing is to be believed, is the proper *ratio* of a Fundamental Article. For, I ſuppoſe it a much clearer notion of *Fundamentals*, to underſtand them, not as *Principles*, from whence Deductions may be drawn of *Theological Truths*; but in regard of that immediate reſpect which they have to mens Salvation. Thoſe things therefore which are neceſſary to be explicitely believed by particular perſons, are *Fundamentals* in order to their Salvation. Now all belief in this caſe ſuppoſing Divine *Revelation*, nothing can be imagined to be neceſſary to be believed, but what may be certainly known to be of *Divine Revelation*. But when we conſider, that beſides the general reaſon of believing what God hath revealed; we muſt either ſuppoſe, that all things are of equal neceſſity, which are revealed in order to the general end of this *Revelation*; or, that ſome things therein contained, are expreſly neceſſary to the end, and other things to be believed on the general account of Faith, ſo far as they are known to be of *Divine Revelation*. Now from hence ariſeth a twofold neceſſity of things to be believed; the firſt more general and large, the ſecond more particular and abſolute. The firſt depends upon the *formal reaſon* of Faith; the ſecond, on the particular *end* of *Divine Revelation*. That which depends on the *formal reaſon* of that *Aſſent* we call *Faith*, is that which ſuppoſeth *Divine Veracity*, or the impoſſibility of Gods deceiving us in any thing revealed by Him; now this extends to all things whatſoever, which are ſuppoſed by men to be of *Divine Revelation*. For, though men may miſtake in the matter, yet the reaſon of Aſ-

ſent

ſent holding, under that miſtake, they are bound neceſſarily to believe whatever is ſuppoſed by them to be *Divine Revelation.* Here lies no difficulty in the ground of Faith, but all the care is to be uſed in the ſearch into the matters which are to be believed on the account of this *Revelation.* But here we are to conſider, that the only thing which is in general and abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, is the general act of Faith, *viz. Believing whatever God reveals to be true*, elſe God's Veracity would be call'd in queſtion; but particular objects cannot be ſaid, on this account, to be abſolutely and univerſally neceſſary, but only ſo far as there are ſufficient convictions, that thoſe particulars are of Divine Revelation. And, the more general and extenſive the means of conviction are, the more large and univerſal is the obligation to Faith. As, that the *Scriptures* contain in them the *Word* of *God*, is a matter of more univerſal obligation, than particular things therein revealed; becauſe the belief of the o· depends upon the acknowledgement of the other. And withal, ſuppoſing it believed, that the matters contained in *Scripture* are of *Divine Revelation*; yet all things are not *equally clear to all capacities*, that they are therein contained. Which is a ſufficient ground for us, to ſay, It was not *God's intention*, that all things contained in his Word, ſhould be believed with the ſame degree of neceſſity by all perſons. And therefore, though the general reaſon of Faith depends on *Gods Veracity*, yet the particular obligation to the belief of particular things, as revealed by God, depends on the *means*, whereby we may be aſſured, that ſuch things are revealed by him: which means admitting of ſo great *Variety*, as to the circumſtances and capacities of particular perſons, there can be no general *Rule* ſet down what things are neceſſary to be believed by all particular perſons. For, thoſe who have greater means of knowledge, a larger capacity, and clearer propoſal, are bound to believe more things explicitly, than thoſe who want all theſe, or have a lower degree of them. In which caſe, it is an unreaſonable thing to ſay, that ſuch a one, who disbelieves any thing propounded to him as a matter of Faith, doth preſently call in queſtion *God's Veracity*; for he may as firmly believe that as any in general, and yet may have ground to queſtion whether *God's Veracity* be at all *concerned* in that which is propounded to him as a matter of Faith; becauſe he ſees no reaſon to believe that this was ever *revealed by God.* And, by this, a clear anſwer is given to that *Queſtion*, which you propoſe: *Whether all thoſe Truths which are ſufficiently propoſed to any Chriſtian, as defined by the Church for matter of Faith, can be diſ-believed by ſuch a Chriſtian, without mortal and damnable ſin, which unrepented deſtroyes Salvation?* To which the anſwer is eaſie upon the grounds here aſſigned: for this queſtion concerning particular perſons, and particular objects of Faith, the reſolution of it doth depend upon the *ſufficiency* of the *means*, to convince ſuch a perſon, that whatever is propounded as Defined by the Church for a matter of Faith, is certainly and truly ſo. For to inſtance in any one of thoſe new Articles of Faith, *Tranſubſtantiation*, or the *Pope's Supremacy*, &c. you tell me, Theſe are neceſſary to be believed, or at leaſt cannot be diſ-believed without ſin (which is all one in this caſe, ſuppoſing clear conviction, for then what cannot be diſbelieved without ſin, muſt be explicitly believed.) I deſire to know the *grounds* why they may not? you tell me, Theſe are truths which are ſufficiently propoſed to me, as defined by the Church for matters of Faith. I deny the Churches Propoſition to be ſufficient to convince me, that theſe are matters of Faith; for I underſtand not what Power your *Church* hath to *define* any thing for *matter of Faith*: if I granted that, I muſt underſtand what you mean by *ſufficient Propoſition*; whether that your *Church* hath

P. 15.

hath ſo defined them, or that ſhe hath power ſo to define them; and becauſe I am heartily willing to believe any thing that I have reaſon to believe is a matter of Faith; certainly it can be no ſin in me, not to believe that which I can ſee no ground at all to believe, either in it ſelf, or becauſe of your *Churches Definition*. And all this while, I have as *high* thoughts of *Gods Veracity*, as you can have, and it may be *higher*; becauſe I *intereſt* it not in the *falſe* and *contradictory Definitions* of your *Church*. If therefore you will prove it to be a damnable ſin not to believe whatever is propoſed by your *Church* for a matter of Faith, you muſt firſt prove, that there is as univerſal an obligation to believe whatever is *ſufficiently propoſed* as defined by the *Church* for matter of Faith, as there is to aſſent to whatever *God reveals as true*. And when you have done this, I will give you leave to ſtate the Queſtion as you do: for then you would offer ſomething to the proof of it, which now you do not. The ſubſtance then of what concerns the obligation to Faith, as to particular objects, on the account of *Divine Revelation*, lyes in the *means* of *conviction* concerning thoſe particular objects being divinely revealed, which being various, the *degrees* of *Aſſent* muſt be various too: but yet ſo that the more men are negligent of the means of conviction, the more culpable their unbelief is; but where men uſe all moral diligence to underſtand what is revealed, and what not, if they cannot be convinced, that ſome particular thing is of Divine Revelation; it is hard to prove them guilty of mortal and damnable ſin, without firſt proving, that *God* abſolutely requires from men an *Aſſent* to that, which it is *impoſſible* in their *Circumſtances* they ſhould believe. And this is the *firſt ſort* of things neceſſary to be believed by particular perſons; *ſuch as are believed on the general account of God's Veracity in revealing them.*

§. 4. But becauſe there muſt be a more particular reaſon aſſigned of any ſuch intention in *God* to reveal his mind to the world, *viz. ſome peculiar end* which he had in it; therefore a further degree of the neceſſity of things to be believed, muſt be enquired after, *viz.* ſuch as have an immediate and neceſſary reſpect to the proſecution of that end. Now the only end aſſignable of that great expreſſion of *Divine Goodneſs*, in declaring to man the *Will of God*, is the *Eternal welfare* and *Happineſs* of mankind, for nothing elſe can be imagined ſuitable and proportionable to the *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs* of *God*; beſides that, this is expreſly mentioned in *Scripture* as God's great end in it. Now this being the great end of Divine Revelation, the neceſſity of things to be believed abſolutely and in themſelves, muſt be taken from the reference or reſpect which they have to the attainment of this end. And, although the diſtinction be commonly received, of *neceſſity of the means*, and *of the command*, as importing a *different kind of neceſſity*, yet in the ſenſe I here take Neceſſity in, the members of that diſtinction do to me ſeem *coincident*. For I cannot ſee any reaſon to believe that *God* ſhould make the *belief* of any thing *neceſſary*, by an *abſolute Command*, but what hath an immediate tendency by way of *means*, for the *attainment* of this *end*: For otherwiſe, that which is called the *Neceſſity of Precept*, falls under the former degree of *Neceſſity*, *viz.* That which is to be believed on the general account of Divine Revelation. And, although theſe things which are neceſſary, as *means*, are to be believed on the ſame *formal reaſon* of Faith; yet ſince *God* had a different *end* in the Revelation of theſe from the other, therefore there is a neceſſity of putting a difference between them. For, ſuppoſing *God* to have ſuch a deſign to bring the ſouls of men to Happineſs; in order to this end ſome means muſt be *neceſſary*, and theſe muſt conſequently be revealed to men, becauſe they are ſo neceſſary in order to ſuch an end; now it is apparent, All things contained in *Scripture*, are not of that nature; ſome being at ſo great

great a remove from this end, that the only reaſon of believing them, is, becauſe they are contained in that Book, which we have the greateſt reaſon to believe, contains nothing falſe in it. Now the only way whereby we may judge of the nature of theſe things, is, from the conſideration of what is made the moſt neceſſary condition in order to happineſs; and the way by which we may come to it. And nothing being more evident, than that the *Goſpel* contains in it a *Covenant of Grace*, or the conditions on which our Salvation depends; whatever is neceſſary in order to our performance of the conditions required of us, muſt be neceſſary to be believed by all. The *Goſpel* therefore tendring Happineſs upon the conditions of our *believing in Chriſt, and walking in him*; theſe two things are indiſpenſably neceſſary to Salvation (where the *Goſpel* is known, for we have no reaſon to enquire into the method of *God's proceeding* with others) *An hearty Aſſent to the Doctrine of Chriſt*, and *A conſcientious walking according to the Precepts of it*. But to undertake to define *what parts* of that Doctrine *are neceſſary* to Salvation, and *what not*, ſeems to me wholly unneceſſary; becauſe the *Aſſent* to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, as revealed *from God*, muſt neceſſarily carry in it ſo much as is ſufficient in order to Salvation. Whatever therefore is neceſſary to a *Spiritual Life*, is neceſſary abſolutely to Salvation, and no more; but what, and how much that is, muſt be gathered by every one as to himſelf from *Scripture*; but is impoſſible to be defined by others, as to all perſons. But in all, *Faith towards God, and in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; *and repentance from dead works*, are abſolutely and indiſpenſably neceſſary to Salvation, which imply in them, both an univerſal readineſs of mind to believe and obey God in all things: And by this we ſee, what the Rule and Meaſure of the neceſſity of things to be believed is, as to particular perſons; which lyes in theſe things.

1. *Whatever God hath revealed, is undoubtedly and infallibly true.*

2. *Whatever appears to me, upon ſufficient enquiry, to be revealed by God, I am bound to believe it by virtue of God's Veracity.*

3. *All things not equally appearing to all perſons to be revealed of God, the ſame meaſure of neceſſity cannot be extended to all perſons.*

4. *An univerſal Aſſent to the Will of God, and univerſal Obedience to it, are abſolutely and indiſpenſably neceſſary to all perſons, to whom God's Word is revealed.*

Thus much may ſuffice concerning what is neceſſary to be believed by particular perſons, conſidered as ſuch.

But this controverſie never need break *Chriſtian Societies* in that ſenſe, but the great difficulty lyes in the other part of it, which is moſt commonly ſtrangely confounded with the former, *viz. What things are neceſſary to be owned, in order to Church-Societies, or Eccleſiaſtical Communion?* For which, we muſt conſider, that the combination of *Chriſtian Societies*, or that which we call the *Catholick Church*, doth ſubſiſt upon the *belief* of what is neceſſary to Salvation. For the very notion of a *Chriſtian Church* doth imply the belief of all thoſe things, which are neceſſary in order to the end of *Chriſtian Religion*, which is mens eternal Happineſs. From whence three things muſt be taken notice of. §. 5.

1. *That the very being of a Church, doth ſuppoſe the neceſſity of what is required to be believed in order to Salvation.* For elſe there could not be ſuch a thing as a *Church* imagined, which is only a combination of men together, upon the belief of ſuch a Doctrine as neceſſary to Salvation; and for the performance of thoſe acts of Worſhip which are ſuitable thereto: Therefore to aſſert the *Church* to have power to make things neceſſary to Salvation, is not only abſurd, but deſtructive to the *Being* of that *Church*. For when it offered to define any thing to be neceſſary, which was not ſo before,

was it a *Church* or no? If it was a *Church*, it believed all things necessary: if it believed *all things* necessary, before it *Defined*; how comes it to make *more things* necessary by its *Definition?* But of this more afterwards.

2. *Whatever Church owns those things which are antecedently necessary to the Being of a Church, cannot so long cease to be a true Church.* Because it retains that which is the Foundation of the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*. Here we must distinguish those things in the *Catholick Church*, which give its *Being*, from those things which are the proper *Acts* of it, as the *Catholick Church*. As to this later, the solemn Worship of God in the way prescribed by him, is necessary; in order to which there must be supposed lawful *Officers* set in the *Church*, and *Sacraments* duly administred: but these I say, are rather the *Exercise* of the *Communion* of the Catholick Church, than that which gives its *Being*, which is, the belief of that *Religion* whereon its *Subsistence* and *Unity* depends; and as long as a Church retains this it keeps its Being, though the *Integrity* and *Perfection* of it depends upon the due exercise of all acts of Communion in it.

3. *The Union of the Catholick Church depends upon the agreement of it, in making the Foundations of its Being, to be the grounds of its Communion.* For the *Unity* being intended to preserve the *Being*, there can be no reason given, why the bonds of *Union* should extend beyond the *Foundation* of its Being, which is, the owning the things necessary to the *Salvation* of all. From whence it necessarily follows, that whatsoever *Church* imposeth the belief of other things *as necessary to Salvation*, which were not so antecedently necessary to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*, doth, as much as in it lies, break the *Unity* of it; and those *Churches*, who desire to preserve its *Unity*, are bound thereby not to have communion with it so long as it doth so. Of what great consequence these principles are to the true understanding the Distance between our Church and yours, if you *see* not now, you may *feel* afterwards.

§. 6. These things being premised, I come to that which is the main subject of the present Dispute, which is, *What those things are which ought to be owned by all Christian-Societies as necessary to Salvation, on which the Being of the Catholick Church depends.* If we can find any sure footing for the *Definition* of these, we shall thereby find what the necessary conditions of *Ecclesiastical Communion* are, and consequently where the proper cause of *Schism* lyes in transgressing those bounds, and what Foundations may be laid for the Peace of the Christian world. Which being of so vast importance, would require a larger discussion, than this place will admit of: but so far as is pertinent to our present subject, I shall enquire into it; and give an account of my thoughts, in these Propositions.

1. *Nothing ought to be owned as necessary to Salvation by Christian-Societies, but such things, which, by the judgement of all those Societies, are antecedently necessary to the Being of the Catholick Church.* For, no reason can be assigned (as I said before) why the *Bonds* of Union should be extended beyond that which is the *Churches Foundation*; neither can there any reason be given why any thing else should be judged necessary to the *Churches Communion*, but what all those *Churches* (who do not manifestly dissent from the Catholick Church of the first Ages) are agreed in, as necessary to be believed by all; this will be further explained afterwards. Only I add here, when I speak of the necessary conditions of *Ecclesiastical Communion*, I speak of such things which must be owned as *Necessary Articles of Faith*, and not of any other *Agreements* for the *Churches Peace*. I deny not therefore, but that in case of great *Divisions* in the *Christian World*, and any *National Churches reforming it self*, that *Church* may declare its sense of those abuses in *Articles of Religion*, and require of men a *Subscription* to them; but then

then we are to consider, that there is a great deal of difference between the owning some Propositions in order to Peace, and the believing of them as necessary Articles of Faith. And this is clearly the state of the difference between the *Church* of *Rome*, and the *Church* of *England*. The *Church* of *Rome* imposeth new *Articles* of *Faith* to be believed as *necessary to Salvation*; as appears by the formerly cited *Bull* of *Pius* 4. Which Articles contain in them the Justification of those things which are most excepted against by other *Churches*; and by her imposing these as the conditions of her Communion, she makes it necessary for other *Churches*, who would preserve the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* upon her true *Foundations*, to forbear her Communion. But the *Church* of *England* makes no *Articles* of *Faith*, but such as have the *Testimony* and *Approbation* of the whole Christian world of all ages, and are acknowledged to be such by *Rome* it self, and in other things she requires *Subscription* to them not as *Articles of Faith*, but as *Inferiour Truths*, which she expects a submission to, in order to her Peace and Tranquillity. So the late learned L. *Primate* of *Ireland* often expresseth the sense of the *Church* of *England*, as to her *thirty nine Articles*. *Neither doth the Church of* England, saith he, *define any of these Questions, as necessary to be believed, either* necessitate medii, *or* necessitate præcepti, *which is much less*; *but only bindeth her Sons, for Peace sake, not to oppose them.* And in another place more fully. *We do not suffer any man to reject the thirty nine Articles of the Church of* England *at his pleasure*; *yet neither do we look upon them as Essentials of Saving Faith, or Legacies of Christ and his Apostles: but in a mean, as pious Opinions fitted for the preservation of Unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them.* By which we see, what a vast difference there is between those things which are required by the *Church* of *England*, in order to Peace; and those which are imposed by the *Church* of *Rome*, as part of that *Faith*, *extra quam non est salus*, without belief of which there is no Salvation. In which she hath as much violated the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*, as the *Church* of *England* by her *Prudence* and *Moderation* hath studied to preserve it.

Bishop *Bramhall*. Schism Guarded. sect. 7. p. 396.

Sect. 1. cap. 11. p. 190. V. Replication to the Bishop of *Chalcedon*. p. 264.

2. *Nothing ought to be imposed as a necessary Article of Faith to be believed by all, but what may be evidently propounded to all persons, as a thing which God did require the explicit belief of.* It being impossible to make any thing appear a necessary Article of Faith, but what may not only be evidently proved to be revealed by *God*, but that *God* doth oblige all men to the belief of it in order to Salvation. And therefore none of those things, whose obligation doth depend on *variety* of *Circumstances*, ought in reason be made the *Bonds* of that *Communion* which cannot take notice of that *variety* as to mens conditions and capacities. There are many things in *Christian Religion*, which, whosoever believes the truth of it, cannot but easily discern to be necessary in order to the profession and practice of it, in most of which the common sense and reason of mankind is agreed. Not only the *Existence of a Deity*, the clear discovery of the *Wisdom*, *Goodness* and *Power* of God, with his *Providence* over the world, and the *Immortality* of *Souls*, being therein most evidently revealed; but, the way and manner of the restitution of mens souls by *Faith* in *Jesus Christ* as our only *Saviour*, and *Obedience* to his *Commands*, is so fully laid down in the clearest terms, that no rational man, who considers the nature of *Christian Religion*, but must assert the profession of all these things to be necessary to all such, who own Christian Religion to be true. But there are many other things in Christian Religion, which are neither so clearly revealed in the *Scriptures*, nor unanimously assented to in any age of the *Christian Church*; §. 7.

and, why any ſuch things ſhould be made the conditions of that *Communion* in the *Catholick Church*, whoſe very being depends only on neceſſary things, would puzzle a *Philoſopher* to underſtand. As if none ſhould be accounted *Mathematicians*, but ſuch as could ſquare circles; and none *Naturaliſts*, but ſuch as could demonſtrate whether quantity were infinitely diviſible or no: much ſo it is, if none ſhould be accounted members of the *Catholick Church*, but ſuch as own the truth and neceſſity of ſome at leaſt as diſputable Points, as any in Religion. Let therefore any *Romaniſt* tell me, whether the *Pope*'s *Supremacy* be as clear in *Scripture*, as that *Chriſt is Saviour of the world*; whether *Purgatory* be as plain as *Eternal Life*; *Tranſubſtantiation* as evident, as that the *Euchariſt ought to be adminiſtred*; whether *Invocation of Saints* be as manifeſt, as the *Adoration of God*; the Doctrine of *Indulgences*, as *Repentance from dead works*; and if there be ſo great a clearneſs in the Revelation of the one, and ſo far from it as to the other; let them give any juſt account why the belief of the one is made as neceſſary to Salvation as the other is. Certainly, ſuch who take in things at leaſt ſo diſputable as all theſe are, and enforce the belief of them in order to their Communion, cannot otherwiſe be thought but to have a deſign to exclude a great part of the Chriſtian world from their Communion; and, to do ſo, and then cry out of them as *Schiſmaticks*, is the moſt unreaſonable proceedings in the world.

§. 8. 3. *Nothing ought to be required as a neceſſary Article of Faith, but what hath been believed and received for ſuch by the Catholick Church of all Ages.* For, ſince neceſſary Articles of Faith are ſuppoſed to be ſo antecedently to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*, ſince the *Catholick Church* doth ſuppoſe the continual acknowledgement of ſuch things as are neceſſary to be believed; it is but juſt and reaſonable to admit nothing as neceſſary, but what appears to have been ſo univerſally received. Thence it is, that *Antiquity*, *Univerſality* and *Conſent*, are ſo much inſiſted on by *Vincentius Lerinenſis*, in order to the proving any thing to be a neceſſary Article of Faith. But the great difficulty of this lies in finding out what was received for a neceſſary Article of Faith, and what was not by the *Catholick Church*; which being a ſubject as neceſſary, as ſeldom ſpoken to, I ſhall not leave it untouched, although I muſt premiſe, that Rule to be much more uſeful in diſcovering what was not looked on as a neceſſary Article of Faith, than what was; and therefore I begin with that firſt.

1. It is ſufficient evidence, that was not looked on as a neceſſary Article of Faith, *which was not admitted into the Ancient Creeds.* Whether all thoſe Declarations which were inſerted in the enlargements of the *Apoſtolical Creed*, by the *Councils* of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople*, and in that *Creed* which goes under the name of *Athanaſius*, were really judged by the *Catholick Church* of all *Ages*, to be neceſſary to Salvation, is not here my buſineſs to enquire; but there ſeems to be a great deal of reaſon for the *Negative*, that what was not inſerted in the *Ancient Creeds*, was not by them judged neceſſary to be believed by all Chriſtians. I know, it is ſaid by ſome of your party, *That the Apoſtolical Creed did only contain thoſe Articles which were neceſſary to be believed, in oppoſition to the preſent Hereſies which were then in the Church.* As though the neceſſity of believing in Chriſtians, came only by an *Antiperiſtaſis* of the oppoſition of *Hereticks*; And if there had been no Hereticks to have denied *God's being the Creatour, and Chriſt's being the Saviour*; it had not been neceſſary to have believed either of them ſo explicitly as now we do. But when we ſpeak of all things neceſſary to be believed by all; I mean not, that all circumſtances of things contained in thoſe *Creeds* are neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation; but, that all thoſe things which were judged as neceſſa-

ry

ry to be believed by all, were therein inſerted, will appear to any one who either conſiders the expreſſions of the *Ancients* concerning the *Creeds* then in Uſe; or the primary reaſon why ſuch *Summaries* of *Faith* were ever made in the Chriſtian Church. The teſtimonies of the *Fathers* to this purpoſe are ſo well known in this ſubject, that it were a needleſs task to repeat them, who ſo unanimouſly aſſert the *ſufficiency*, *unalterableneſs* and *perfection* of that *Faith*, which is contained in the *Creed*; making it, *the ſum of all neceſſary Doctrines, the Foundation of the Catholick Faith and of the Church, the firſt and ſole Confeſſion of Evangelical Doctrine.* Of all which, and many more expreſſions to the ſame purpoſe, produced not only by our Writers, but by yours too, no tolerable ſenſe can be made, without aſſerting, that whatever was judged neceſſary to be believed by all, by the *Catholick Church* of that *Age* they lived in, or before them, was therein contained. Beſides, what account can be given why any ſuch *Summaries* of *Faith* ſhould at all be made either by *Apoſtles*, or *Apoſtolical perſons*; but only for that end, that neceſſary *Articles of Faith* might be reduced into ſuch a compaſs, as might become portable to the weakeſt capacities? If the riſe of *Creeds* were (as moſt probable it was) from the things propounded, to the *Catechumens*, to be believed in order to Baptiſm, can we reaſonably think, that any thing judged neceſſary to be believed, ſhould be left out? If the *Apoſtolical Creed* be a ſummary comprehenſion of that *Form of ſound Doctrine*, which the *Apoſtles* delivered to all Chriſtians at their firſt converſion (as it is generally ſuppoſed) either we muſt think the *Apoſtles* unfaithful in their work, or the *Creed* an unfaithful account of their Doctrine, or that ſuch things which were ſuppoſed univerſally neceſſary to be believed, are therein comprehended. Which is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that nothing ought to be looked on as a neceſſary Article of Faith, or was ſo eſteemed by the *Catholick Church*, which is not contained in the Ancient Creeds.

Irenæus l. 1. c. 2, 3. Tertul. de veland. virgin. c. 1. de præſcript. c. 13, 14. Cyril. Hieroſolomit. Catech. 4, 5. Hieron. ep. 61. ad Pammach. Auguſtin. de ſymbol. ad Catech. l. 3. c. 1. de temp. ſerm. 115, 119, 131, 181. Ambroſ. ſerm. 38. de jejun. & Quadrag. &c. Hilar. ad Conſtant. Aug. Ruffinus in ſymbol. c. 2.

2. Nothing ought to be judged a neceſſary Article of Faith, but *what was univerſally believed by the Catholick Church, to be delivered as ſuch by Chriſt, or his Apoſtles.* So that it is not the judgement, but the teſtimony of the *Catholick Church*, which muſt be relyed on, and that teſtimony only, when univerſal, as delivering what was once infallibly delivered by *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles*. From whence it follows, that any one who will undertake to make out any thing as a neceſſary Article of Faith, by *Catholick Tradition* meerly, muſt do theſe things:

1. He muſt make it appear to be univerſally embraced at all times, and in all places, by ſuch who were members of the *Catholick Church*.

2. That none ever oppoſed it, but he was preſently diſowned as no member of the *Catholick Church*, becauſe oppoſing ſomething neceſſary to Salvation.

3. That it be delivered by all thoſe Writers of the *Church*, who give an account of the *Faith of Chriſtians*, or what was delivered by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* to the *Church*.

4. That it was not barely looked on as neceſſary to be believed by ſuch as might be convinced it was of *Divine Revelation*, but that it was delivered with a neceſſity of its being explicitly believed by all.

5. That what is delivered by the conſent of the *Writers* of the *Catholick Church*, was undoubtedly the *Conſent* of the *Church* of thoſe ages.

6. That all thoſe *Writers* agree not only in the *Belief* of the thing it ſelf, but of the *Neceſſity* of it to all Chriſtians.

7. That no *Writers* or *Fathers* of ſucceeding *Ages*, can be ſuppoſed to *alter* in the belief either of the matters believed before, or the neceſſity of them.

8. That

8. That no oppoſitions of Hereticks, or heats of Contention, could make them judge any Article ſo oppoſed, to be *more neceſſary*, than it was judged before that Contention; or they themſelves would have judged it, had it not been ſo oppoſed.

9. That when they affirm many *Traditions* to be *Apoſtolical*, which yet varied in ſeveral Churches, they could not affirm any *Doctrine* to be *Apoſtolical*, which they were not univerſally agreed in.

10. That when they ſo plainly aſſert the ſufficiency of the *Scriptures* as a Rule of Faith, they did yet believe ſomething neceſſary to Salvation, which was not contained therein.

When you, or any one elſe, will undertake to make good theſe conditions; I ſhall then begin to believe, that ſomething may be made appear to be a neceſſary Article of Faith, which is not clearly revealed in Scripture, but not before: but till then this *Negative* will ſuffice, that nothing ought to be embraced, as the judgement of the Church concerning a neceſſary Article of Faith, but what appears to be clearly revealed in Scripture, and univerſally embraced by the Catholick Church of all Ages.

3. Nothing ought to be looked on as a neceſſary Article of Faith, by the judgement of the Catholick Church, the *denyal of which was not univerſally oppoſed, and condemned as Hereſie.* For otherwiſe the *Catholick Church* was very little ſenſible of the honour of *Chriſtian Faith*, if it ſuffered diſſenters in neceſſary things, without putting a mark of diſhonour upon them. Therefore we may conclude, that whatever was patiently born with in ſuch as diſſented from the generality of Chriſtians, eſpecially, if conſiderable *perſons* in the *Church* were the authors or fomenters of ſuch opinions, however true the contrary Doctrine was ſuppoſed to be, yet it was not ſuppoſed neceſſary, becauſe then the oppoſers would have been condemned of Hereſie, by ſome open act of the *Catholick Church.*

§. 9. But if, beyond theſe *Negatives*, we would enquire what was poſitively believed as neceſſary to Salvation, by the *Catholick Church*; we ſhall hardly find any better way, than by the Articles of the *Ancient Creeds*, and the univerſal oppoſition of any new Doctrine on its firſt appearance, and the condemning the broachers of it for *Hereſie* in *Oecumenical Councils*, with the continual diſapprobation of thoſe Doctrines by the *Chriſtian Churches of all Ages.* As is clear in the caſes of *Arrius* and *Pelagius.* For it ſeems very reaſonable to judge, that ſince the neceſſary Articles of Faith were all delivered by the *Apoſtles* to the *Catholick Church*, ſince the foundation of that *Church* lies in the belief of thoſe things, which are *neceſſary*, that nothing ſhould be delivered contrary to any *neceſſary Article of Faith*, but the *Church*, by ſome *evident act*, muſt declare its diſlike of it, and its reſolution thereby to adhere to that neceſſary Doctrine, which was *once delivered to the Saints.* And withal, it ſeems reaſonable, that becauſe Art and Subtilty may be uſed by ſuch who ſeek to pervert the *Catholick Doctrine*, and to wreſt the plain places of *Scripture*, which deliver it, ſo far from their proper meaning, that very few ordinary capacities may be able to clear themſelves of ſuch miſts as are caſt before their eyes; the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* in ſucceeding ages, may be a very uſeful way for us to embrace the true ſenſe of Scripture, eſpecially in the great Articles of the *Chriſtian Faith.* As for inſtance, in the Doctrine of the *Deity of Chriſt*, or the *Trinity*; though the ſubtilty of ſuch Modern Hereticks, who oppoſe either of theſe, may ſo far prevail on perſons, either not of ſufficient judgement, or not ſufficiently verſed in the *Scriptures*, as at preſent to make them acknowledge the places are not ſo clear as they imagined them to be; yet they being always otherwiſe interpreted by the *Catholick Church*, or the *Chriſtian Societies* of all ages, layes this potent prejudice againſt

againſt all ſuch attempts, as not to believe ſuch interpretations *true*, till they give a juſt account, why, if the belief of theſe *Doctrines* were not *neceſſary*, the *Chriſtians* of all ages from the *Apoſtles* times, did ſo unanimouſly agree in them, that when any began firſt to oppoſe them, they were declared and condemned for *Hereticks* for their pains. So that the *Church* of *England* doth very piouſly declare her conſent with the Ancient *Catholick Church*, in not admitting any thing to be delivered as the ſenſe of *Scripture*, which is contrary to the conſent of the *Catholick Church* in the four firſt ages. Not as though the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* were pretended to be any infallible Rule of interpreting *Scripture* in all things which concern the Rule of Faith; but that it is a ſufficient *Preſcription* againſt any thing which can be alledged out of Scripture, that if it appear contrary to the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* from the beginning, it ought not to be looked on as the true *meaning* of the *Scripture*. All this ſecurity is built upon this ſtrong preſumption, that nothing contrary to the neceſſary *Articles* of *Faith*, ſhould be held by the *Catholick Church*, whoſe very being depends upon the belief of thoſe things which are neceſſary to Salvation. As long therefore as the *Church* might appear to be truly *Catholick* by thoſe correſpondencies which were maintained between the ſeveral parts of it, that what was refuſed by one, was ſo by all; ſo long this unanimous and uncontradicted ſenſe of the *Catholick Church*, ought to have a great ſway upon the minds of ſuch who yet profeſs themſelves members of the *Catholick Church*. From whence it follows, that ſuch Doctrines may well be judged deſtructive to the Rule of Faith, which were ſo unanimouſly condemned by the *Catholick Church* within that time. And thus much may ſuffice for the firſt inquiry, *viz. What things are to be eſteemed neceſſary, either in order to Salvation, or in order to Eccleſiaſtical Communion.*

§. 10. 2. *Whether any thing which was not neceſſary to Salvation, may by any means whatſoever afterwards become neceſſary, ſo that the not believing it becomes damnable, and unrepented deſtroys Salvation?* We ſuppoſe the Queſtion to proceed on ſuch things as could not antecedently to ſuch an act whereby they now become neceſſary, be eſteemed to be ſo, either from the matter, or from any expreſs command. For you in terms aſſert a neceſſity of believing diſtinct from the matter, and abſolute command, and hath the *Churches Definition* for its *formal object*, which makes the neceſſity of our Faith continually to depend upon the Churches Definition; but this ſtrange kind of *Ambulatory Faith*, I ſhall now ſhew to be repugnant to the deſign of Chriſt and his *Apoſtles*, in making known Chriſtian Religion, and to all evidence of Reaſon, and directly contrary to the plain and uncontradicted ſenſe of the *Primitive and Catholick Church*.

1. It is contrary to the *deſign of Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, in making known the Chriſtian Religion to the world. For, if the deſign of Chriſt was to declare whatever was neceſſary to the Salvation of mankind, if the *Apoſtles* were ſent abroad for this very end, then either they were very *unfaithful* in diſcharge of their truſt, or elſe they taught *all things neceſſary* for their Salvation; and, if they did ſo, how can any thing become *neceſſary*, which they did never teach? Was it not the great Promiſe concerning the *Meſſias*, that at his coming, *the Earth ſhould be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea*; that then *they ſhall all be taught of God*? Was not this the juſt expectation of the people concerning him, *That when he came he would tell them all things?* Doth not he tell his Diſciples, *That all things I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you?* And, for all this, is there ſomething ſtill remaining neceſſary to Salvation, which neither he, nor his Diſciples, did ever make known to the world? Doth not he *promiſe Life and Salvation to all ſuch as believe and obey his Doctrine?* And can any thing

Iſa. 11. 9. Joh. 6. 45. Joh. 4. 25. Joh. 15. 15.

be

be neceſſary for eternal life, which he never declared? or did he only promiſe it to the men of that *Age* and *Generation*, and leave others to the *mercy* of the *Churches Definitions*? If this be ſo, we have ſad cauſe to lament our condition, upon whom theſe *heavy loyns* of the *Church* are fallen: how happy had we been, if we had lived in *Chriſts*, or the *Apoſtles times*; for then we might have been ſaved, though we had never believed the *Pope's Supremacy*, or *Tranſubſtantiation*, or *Invocation of Saints*, or *Worſhipping Images*; but now the caſe is altered; theſe *Millſtones* are now hung about our necks, and how we ſhall ſwim to Heaven with them, who knows? How ſtrangely miſtaken was our *Saviour*, when he ſaid, *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and yet have believed*; For, much more bleſſed certainly were they, who did ſee him, and believe in him; for then he would undertake for their Salvation; but now, it ſeems, we are out of his reach, and turned over to the *Mercileſs Infallibility* of the *preſent Church*. When *Chriſt* told his Diſciples, *His yoke was eaſie, and burden light*; he little thought, what *Power* he had left in the *Church* to lay on ſo much *load*, as might *cripple* mens belief; were it not for a good reſerve in a corner, call'd *Implicit Faith*. When he ſent the *Apoſtles to teach all that he commanded them*, he muſt be underſtood ſo, that the *Church* hath power to teach *more* if ſhe pleaſes; and though the *Apoſtles*, poor men, were bound up by this commiſſion, and St. *Peter* himſelf too, yet his *Infallible Succeſſors* have a *Paramount Priviledge* beyond them all. Though the *Spirit* was promiſed to the Apoſtles, *to lead them into all Truth*, yet there muſt be no incongruity, in ſaying, They underſtood not ſome neceſſary Truths (for how ſhould they, when never revealed) as *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Supremacy*, *&c.* Becauſe, though they never dreamt of ſuch things, yet the *Infallible Church* hath done it ſince for them; and, to ſay truth, though the *Apoſtles* names were put into the promiſe, yet they were but *Feoffees* in truſt for the *Church*, and the benefit comes to the Church by them. For they were only *Tutors* to the *Church* in its minority, teaching it ſome *poor Rudiments of Chriſt and Heaven*, of *Faith and Obedience*, *&c.* But the *great* and *Divine Myſteries* of the *ſeven Sacraments*, *Indulgences*, *Worſhip of Images*, *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *&c.* were not fit to be made known till the *Church* were *at age* her ſelf, and knew how to declare her own mind. When S. *Paul* ſpeaks ſo much of the *great Myſteries hidden from Ages and Generations*, *but now made known*, it muſt be underſtood with a reference to thoſe *ſilly people* who lived in *that Age*; but there were *greater Myſteries* than theſe, which neither *Chriſt*, nor any *of his Apoſtles* were ever acquainted with, as *Purgatory*, and thoſe before mentioned; for theſe were reſerved as the *Churches Portion*, when her *Infallibility-ſhip* ſhould come *to Age*. S. *Paul*, honeſt man, ſpake as he thought, when he told not the common people, but the *Biſhops* of the *Church*, *That he had not ſhunned to declare unto them all the Counſel of God*; but if he had lived to our *Age*, he would have heard of this miſtake with both ears; and if he had not ſworn the contrary, he muſt have been contented to have been call'd *Schiſmatick* and *Heretick* a thouſand times over. Theſe are all the juſt and rare conſequences of your *Churches bleſſed Infallibility*, *and Power of Defining things neceſſary*, *which were not ſo in Chriſt*, *or his Apoſtles times*. But, the greateſt *knack* of all is yet behind; for men are bound to believe all the *Doctrines* of your *Church* to be *Apoſtolical*, and yet that your *Church* hath power to make things neceſſary to be believed, which were not ſo in the *Apoſtolical times*. Yes, ſay you, *They were Doctrines then*, *but not ſo neceſſary as now*, *becauſe they had not the Churches Definition*. It ſeems, at laſt, the *Apoſtles* knew them, but did not underſtand the worth of them; elſe, no doubt, they were ſuch charitable ſouls, they would have declared them to the world. *Bleſſed S. Paul*, who was continually employed in teaching and inſtructing men in the way

Act. 20. 27.

to

to Salvation, could he have held back any thing that had tended to it, when he ſayes, *He kept back nothing that was profitable to them, but ſhewed them, and taught them publickly, and from houſe to houſe, teſtifying to the Jews, and alſo to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt:* What, not one word of the neceſſary Points all this while? nothing of the *Church* of *Rome*, nor *Chriſt's Vicar on Earth*, and his *Infallibility?* How ſlily and cunningly did S. *Paul*, and the reſt of the *Apoſtles* carry it, if they had believed theſe things; never let one word drop from their mouths or pens concerning them? and inſtead of that, ſpeak ſo, and write ſo, that one that believes them honeſt, would ſwear they never heard of them. In what another kind of ſtrain would S. *Paul* have writ to the *Church* of *Rome*, if he had had but any inkling of the *Chair* of *Infallibility*, being placed there? How ſoon would he have blotted out the whole 14*th Chapter* of his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, if he had known his *Holineſs* his pleaſure about *ſerving God in an unknown tongue?* How well might he have ſpared ſaying, *That a Biſhop ſhould be the Husband of one Wife*, if he had known *de jure divino* he muſt have none at all? At what another rate would he have diſcourſed of the *Euchariſt*, had he believed *Tranſubſtantiation, Sacrifice of the Maſs, Communion under one kind?* What courſe would he have taken with the *Schiſmatical Corinthians*, that were divided like other *Churches*, if he had known the *Infallible Judge of Controverſie?* If he had but underſtood the danger of *reading Scriptures*, he might have ſpared his exhortations to the people *of the Word of God dwelling richly in them*, and filled his Epiſtles with *Pater Noſters*, and *Ave Mary's*, or given good directions about them. But he muſt be pardoned, he was ignorant of theſe things, as well as we: only S. *Paul* never heard of them, and we do not believe them; becauſe neither he, nor his Brethren ever revealed them to us, though they were the *Stewards of the Myſteries of God*; and they tell us themſelves, That *it is requiſite ſuch ſhould be faithful*, which we cannot underſtand how they could be, if they knew theſe deep Myſteries, but never diſcovered them that we can learn. But, if they knew them not, I pray from whence is it your *Church* learns them? *By immediate inſpiration? no*, as bold as you are, you dare not challenge that: but whence then come you to know them to be neceſſary? *infallibly forſooth:* But whence comes this *Infallibility?* muſt there not be a *peculiar Revelation*, to diſcover that to be neceſſary, which was never diſcovered to be ſo before? But if diſcovered before, and declared before, the things were as neceſſary before your *Churches Definition*, as after; and therefore your *Churches Definition* adds nothing of *neceſſity* to them. If *neither diſcovered*, nor *declared*, you muſt have particular *Revelation* for them, and then *work miracles*, and we will believe you, but not otherwiſe; but, before you do it, conſider what S. *Paul* hath ſaid concerning *an Angel from Heaven preaching another Goſpel, let him be accurſed*; and what can be more *preaching another Goſpel*, than making other things *neceſſary to Salvation*, than *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* did; and think then what your *Church* hath deſerved for all her *Definitions* concerning *Articles of Faith*, or things neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation. But yet further you ſay, *That theſe things were declared by the Apoſtles, but they need a further Declaration now:* And why ſo? ſhew us the *Apoſtle's Declaration*, and it ſufficeth us; we ſhall not believe them one jot the more for your additional Definition. And it is ſurely a ſign, you did not think the *Apoſtles Declaration* ſufficient, or elſe you would never pretend to new ones. Perhaps you will tell us, *It was to their Age, but not to ours?* why not, as well as the other neceſſary Articles of Faith contained in *Scripture?* I know your Anſwer is, *We can know no neceſſary Article of Faith at all; but from your Church.* So then, we

Act. 20. 20, 21.

have brought all into a narrow compaſs, and inſtead of new *Definitions* of the *Church* concerning neceſſary things, we can know nothing at all to be *neceſſary to be believed*, but from your *Church*. This is *high*, but the *higher* it is, the *better Foundation* it had need ſtand on, which we ſhall throughly ſearch into; in the Controverſie of the reſolution of Faith: to which we refer it, and return. If there were once a *Declaration*, but ſtill there needs *another*, What is become of that *Declaration?* was it loſt in its paſſage down to us? how then was that preſent *Church infallible*, which *loſt a Declaration* in matter of Faith? was it neceſſary to be believed in the intermediate *Age* or no? if it was, then it was not *loſt*, and then what need a new *Declaration?* if not, then a thing once *neceſſary* to *Salvation*, may be *not neceſſary* to Salvation, and become *neceſſary to Salvation* again. But ſtill we have cauſe to envy their happineſs, who lived in the Age when they might be ſaved without believing theſe things: for the caſe goes hard with us, for you tell us, Unleſs we believe them neceſſary, we cannot be ſaved; and our conſciences tell us, that if we did profeſs to believe them neceſſary, when we do not, and cannot, we cannot be ſaved. What a caſe then were we in, if the *Pope* were *Chriſts Vicar* in *Heaven*, as he pretends to *be on Earth*; but it is our comfort, he is neither ſo, nor ſo. Thus we ſee what repugnancy there is both to *Scripture* and *Reaſon* in this ſtrange Doctrine of your *Churches Definitions making things neceſſary to Salvation, which were not ſo before.*

§. 11. I ſhould now proceed to ſhew how repugnant this *Doctrine* is to the unanimous conſent of *Antiquity*; but I find my ſelf prevented in that, by the late *Writings* of one of your own *Communion*; and if you will believe him in his *Epiſtle Dedicatory* (which I much queſtion) *the preſent Popes moſt humble Servant*, our Countryman Mr. *Thomas White*. Whoſe whole Book, call'd his *Tabulæ Suffragiales*, is purpoſely deſigned againſt this fond and abſurd Opinion; nay, he goes ſo high, as to aſſert the Opinion of the *Pope's Perſonal Infallibility*, not only to be *Heretical*, but *Archi-heretical*; and *that the propagating of this Doctrine is in its kind a moſt grievous ſin.* It cannot but much rejoyce us to ſee, that men of wit and parts begin to diſcover the intolerable arrogance of ſuch pretences, and that ſuch men as D. *Holden*, and Mr. *White*, are in many things come ſo near the *Proteſtant Principles*; and that ſince they quit the *Plea* of *Infallibility*, and relye on *Univerſal Tradition*, we are in hopes that the ſame reaſon and ingenuity which carried theſe perſons thus far, will carry others, who go on the ſame principles, ſo much farther, as to ſee, how impoſſible it is to make good the points in *Controverſie* between us, upon the *Principle of Univerſal Tradition.* Which the *Bigots* of your *Church* are ſufficiently ſenſible of, and therefore like the *Man* at *Athens*, when *your Hands* are *cut off*, you are reſolved to hold this Infallibility with *your Teeth:* and ſo that *Gentleman* finds by the proceedings of the *Court* of *Rome* againſt him for that and his other pieces. But, this ſhould not have been taken notice of, leſt we ſhould ſeem to ſee (as who doth not, that is not ſtark blind?) what growing Diviſions and *Animoſities* there are among your ſelves both at home and in foreign parts; and yet all this while the poor ſilly people muſt be told, that there is nothing but *Diviſion* out of your *Church*, and nothing but *Harmony* and *Muſick* in it, but ſuch as is made of *Diſcords.* And that about this preſent Controverſie; for the forenamed *Gentleman* in his Epiſtle to the *preſent Pope*, tells him plainly, *That it is found true by frequent Experience, that there is no defending the Catholick Faith againſt the ſubtilties of his Heretical Countrymen, without the principles of that Book, which was condemned at* Rome. And what thoſe

Tabulæ ſuff. cap. 19,20,21.

Neq; ſi complurium experimentis fidem habere liceat, adverſus noſtratium hæreticorum ſubtilitates fides catholica ſuſtineri poteſt abſq; præcipuis hujus libelli dogmatibus, & (ſi conjicere fas ſit) aliquibus accuſatis. Tabulæ ſuffrag. ep. dedicat. ad Papam Alex. 7.

thoſe principles are, we may eaſily ſee by this Book, which is writ in defence of the former. Wherein he largely proves, that the *Church* hath no power to make *New Articles of Faith*, which he proves both from *Scripture*, *Reaſon* and *Authority*; this laſt, is that I ſhall refer the Reader to him for: for in his ſecond *Table*, as he calls it, he proves from the teſtimonies of *Origen*, *Baſil*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Cyril*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Pope Stephen*, *Hieron*, *Theophylact*, *Auguſtine*, *Vincentius Lerinenſis*, and ſeveral others; nay, the teſtimonies, he ſayes, to this purpoſe, are ſo many, that whole *Libraries* muſt be tranſcribed to produce them all. And afterwards more largely proves, That the Faith of the *Church* lyes in a continued ſucceſſion from the *Apoſtles*, both from *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, and abundance of *Church Authorities* in his 4, 5, and 6 *Tables*: and, through the reſt of his Book diſproves the *Infallibility of Councils and Pope*. And, can you think all this is anſwered by an *Index Expurgatorius*, or by publiſhing a *falſe Latine Order* of the *Inquiſition* at *Rome*, whereby his Books are prohibited, and his Opinions condemned as heretical, erroneous in Faith, raſh, ſcandalous, ſeditious, and what not? It ſeems then, it is grown at laſt *de fide*, that the *Pope is Infallible*, and never more like to do ſo, than in this age; for the ſame perſon gives us this character of it in his Purgation of himſelf, to the *Cardinals* of the Inquiſition, ſaying, *That their Eminencies, by the unhappineſs of the preſent Age, in which Knowledge is baniſhed out of the Schools, and the Doctrines of Faith and Theological Truths are judged by moſt voices; fell, it ſeems, upon ſome ignorant and arrogant Conſultors; who, hand over head, condemn thoſe Propoſitions, which upon their oaths, they could not tell whether they were true or falſe.* If theſe be your proceedings at *Rome*, happy we that have nothing to do with ſuch *Infallible Ignorance*: This is the *Age* your *Religion* were like to thrive in, if *Ignorance* were as *predominant* elſewhere, as it ſeems it is at *Rome*. But I leave this, and return.

Tabulæ ſuffrag. tab. 2. p. 11, &c.

V. exemplar ipſius Decreti apud Theo. Albiz purgat. p. 9.

Eminentiſſimos Præſules, infortunio præſentis ſeculi, in quo ſcientia ex Scholis exulat, & fidei & Theologiæ veritates numero votorum æſtimantur, incidiſſe in Conſultores ex majori parte & ignaros & arrogantes, qui intrepidè configant propoſitiones, quas jurati aſſerant ſe nescire, ſintne veræ vel falſæ. Appendix Albiana ad Purgat. ſect. poſter. p. 212. A. D. 1652.

3. The laſt thing is, *Whether the Church hath Power by any Propoſition or Definition, to make any thing become neceſſary to Salvation, and to be believed as ſuch which was not ſo before?* But this is already anſwered by the foregoing Diſcourſe; for if the neceſſity of the things to be believed, muſt be ſuppoſed antecedently to the *Church's Being*, if that which was not before neceſſary, cannot by any act whatſoever afterwards become neceſſary, then it unavoidably follows, That the Church neither hath, nor can have any ſuch power. Other things which relate to this, we ſhall have occaſion to diſcuſs in following your ſteps: which having thus far cleared this important Controverſie, I betake my ſelf to. §. 12.

And we are highly obliged to you, for the rare Divertiſements you give us in your excellent way of managing Controverſies. Had my *Lord of Canterbury* been living, What an excellent entertainment would your Confutation of his Book have afforded him? But, ſince ſo *pleaſant* a *Province* is fallen to my ſhare, I muſt learn to command my ſelf in the management of it, and therefore, where you preſent us with any thing which deſerves a ſerious Anſwer, for truth and the Cauſes ſake, you ſhall be ſure to have it. In the firſt place, you charge his Lordſhip with a Fallacy, and that is, becauſe, when he was to ſpeak of Fundamentals, he did not ſpeak of that which was not Fundamental. *But*, ſay you, *He turns the difficulty, which only proceeded upon a Fundamentality or Neceſſity, derived from the formal Object, that is, from the Divine Authority revealing that Point, to the Material Object, that is, to the importance of the Matter contained in the Point revealed; which is a plain Fallacy, in paſſing à ſenſu formali ad materialem.* P. 15. n. 4.

Men ſeldom ſuſpect thoſe faults in others, which they find not ſtrong inclinations to in themſelves; had you not been conſcious of a notorious *Fallacy* in this diſtinction of *Formal and Material Object*, as here applied by you; you would never have ſuſpected any ſuch *Sophiſtry* in his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe. I pray conſider what kind of *Fundamentals* thoſe are, which the *Queſtion* proceeds on, *viz.* ſuch as are neceſſary to be owned as ſuch by *all Churches*, in order to their being *true Churches*, as is plain by the riſe of this Controverſie; for Mr. *Fiſher* was proving the *Greek Church to be no true Church*, and, in order to that, proves, that *ſhe erred Fundamentally*, for which he makes *Uſe* of this *Medium*; That, *whatever is defined by the Church is Fundamental*. So that the whole Proceſs of the Diſpute lyes thus. What ever *Church* is guilty of a *Fundamental Errour*, ceaſeth to be a *true Church*; but the *Greek Church* is guilty of a *Fundamental* Error; *ergo*. The *Minor* being denied, he thus proves it: *If whatever is defined by the Church be Fundamental, then the Greek Church is guilty of a Fundamental error, becauſe ſhe denies ſomething defined by the Church; but whatever is defined by the Church is Fundamental*; which is the thing his Lordſhip denies, and his adverſary is bound to prove. So that any one who was not reſolved to wink as hard as you do, might eaſily ſee, the ſtate of the Controverſie doth not concern what things are *Fundamental*, ſuppoſing men know them to be *ſufficiently propounded*; but what things are ſo neceſſary to be owned for *Fundamentals*, that upon the denying them, a *Church* ceaſeth to be a *true Church*. Yet this miſtake as groſs and palpable as it is, runs through your whole Diſcourſe of *Fundamentals*, which, without it cannot hold together. If you will therefore prove, that, beſides ſuch things whoſe neceſſity ariſeth from the matter, there are other from the Formal Object, which all *Churches* are equally bound to believe, in order to their being *true Churches*, you do ſomething; but not before.

But we muſt ſtill attend your Motions, eſpecially when they tend towards proofs, as yours do now. For, ſay you, *Now I ſhew (the difficulty being underſtood, as it ought to be of the Formal Object, whereby Points of Faith are manifeſted to Chriſtians) that all Points defined by the Church as matter of Faith, are Fundamental; that is, neceſſary to Salvation to be believed, by all thoſe to whom they are ſufficiently propounded to be ſo defined by this Argument. Whoſoever refuſeth to believe any thing ſufficiently propounded to him for a truth revealed from God, commits a ſin damnable and deſtructive of Salvation: But, whoſoever refuſes to believe any Point ſufficiently propounded to him for defined by the Church as matter of Faith, refuſes to believe a thing ſufficiently propounded to him for a truth revealed from God.* Ergo, *Whoſoever refuſes to believe any Point ſufficiently propounded to him for defined by the Church as matter of Faith, commits a ſin damnable and deſtructive of Salvation.* Before you proceed to the proof of your *Minor*, ſeveral things muſt here be conſidered, that we may better underſtand your meaning, and know what it is you intend to prove. Eſpecially what you intend by *ſufficient Propoſition*. Do you mean ſuch a Propoſition as carries evidence along with it, or not? in which caſe the very underſtanding the terms, is *ſufficient Propoſition*, as that, *two and two make four*; but, I ſuppoſe, you mean not this, therefore it muſt be the *ſufficient Propoſition of ſomething which wants natural evidence*; and therefore ſomething elſe muſt be required, beſides the propounding the thing, to make the Propoſition be ſaid to be ſufficient. For *Sufficiency* relates to ſome *end*; ſo that a ſufficient Propoſition muſt be ſuch a *Propoſition* as is *ſufficient* for its end: now the end of the *Propoſition* of *Matters* of *Faith*, is, that they may be *believed*; and therefore the *ſufficiency* of the *Propoſition* lyes in the *Arguments* or *Motives* inducing men to believe. Now the *Objects* of *Faith* being

ing

ing of a different nature, the *Sufficiency* of the *Propoſition* muſt be taken from a reſpect to them: for in things which are ſo clearly revealed, as neceſſary to Salvation, that none who acknowledge the *Scripture to be God's Word*, can doubt but ſuch things are neceſſary; in this caſe the *Sufficiency* of the *Propoſition* lyes in the *Evidence* of *Divine Revelation*, and the clearneſs of it to all underſtandings who conſider it, and the *Reaſons* or *Motives* of Faith in that caſe, are the ſame with thoſe which induce men to believe, that the *Scripture it ſelf is from Divine Revelation*. But there being other things in *Scripture*, which neither appear ſo clear, or ſo neceſſary to be believed by all, ſomething elſe is required in order to a *ſufficient Propoſition* of them, and in order to the making any of theſe things univerſally obligatory to *Chriſt ans* on pain of damnation, for not believing them, theſe things are neceſſary. 1. It muſt be *much clearer* than the thing which is propounded to be believed on the account of it; for, to propound a thing to be believed by ſomething at leſt as diſputable as the matter it ſelf, cannot certainly be called a *ſufficient Propoſition*. 2. It muſt be *antecedently proved* to be a true and certain Propoſition, before any thing can be believed on the account of it. For, if men cannot ſee any reaſon to believe that there is any *neceſſary Connexion* between that which you call a ſufficient Propoſition, and any matter of Faith; they cannot be guilty of any ſin at all in not believing what you think is ſufficiently propounded. But, in this caſe it is not your judgement, what *Propoſition* is ſufficient that makes it ſo, but the *Reaſon* of the *Thing*, and the *Evidence* that *God* hath appointed that way to reveal his Will to men, and that what is ſo propounded is neceſſary to be believed. As for inſtance, ſuppoſe you were told by the *Greek Church*, that to believe the *Pope's Supremacy*, *jure divino*, were a damnable ſin, and that whoſoever did not believe this being ſufficiently propounded to them as a matter of Faith, as defined by the *Church*, were guilty of a ſin deſtructive to Salvation, what anſwer would you return in this caſe? Would you not ſay, That the *Propoſition*, though judged *ſufficient* by them, is not judged ſo by you; and that they muſt firſt prove, that whatever their *Church defines* as a matter of Faith, is to be believed for ſuch, before the other can be believed on the account of it? Juſt the ſame anſwer we return to you; prove firſt of all to us in a clear and evident manner, that *God* hath appointed the *Definition* of your *Church*, as the means whereby we may be infallibly *aſſured*, what is *Matter* of *Faith*, and what not; and then we may grant, that what your *Church* propounds as a matter of Faith, is ſufficiently propounded as a matter revealed from God, but not before. For, while I ſee no reaſon to believe the *Churches Propoſition* to be *ſufficient*, I have no reaſon to believe, that what ſhe propounds, as defined for matter of Faith, is truly ſo: And, as long as I can ſee no reaſon to believe it, prove the diſbelief of it to be a ſin in me when you can. Thus we ſee how far from being evident that *Major* of yours is, though you are pleaſed to tell us, it is ſo; but we do not believe your *Defining* it to be ſo, to be *any matter of Faith*, unleſs we had better reaſon for it, than we have. For, ſay you, *To refuſe to believe God's Revelation, is either to give God the lye, or to doubt whether he ſpeak truth or no?* P. 16. But, have you ſo little wit, as not to diſtinguiſh between *not believing God's Revelation*, and *not believing what is propounded for God's Revelation?* Muſt every one, who doth not believe every thing that is propounded for *God's Revelation*, preſently give *God the lye*, *and doubt whether he ſpeak truth or no?* And are not you then guilty of that fault every time a *Quaker* or *Enthuſiaſt* tells you, That the *Spirit of God within him told him this and that?* But you ſaid, *Sufficiently propounded*. But the Queſtion is, What *ſufficient Propoſition* is, and who muſt be Judge whether the Propoſition be ſufficient or

no,

no, you, or the conſcience of the perſon to whom the thing is propoſed to be believed? If any one indeed that judgeth a Propoſition ſufficient, do notwithſtanding queſtion the *truth* of it, he doth interpretatively call *God's Veracity* into queſtion; but not he certainly who thinks not *God's Veracity* at all concerned in that which *you call* a ſufficient Propoſition, but *he judgeth not to be ſo.*

Let us now ſee, how you prove your *Aſſumption*, which is very fairly done from a Suppoſition which his *Lordſhip* denies; which is, *That General*
P. 28. n. 3. *Councils cannot err.* But, ſay you, he adds, *That though he ſhould grant it, yet this cannot down with him, that all Points even ſo defined were Fundamentals.* I grant thoſe are his words, and his reaſons follow them. *For, Deductions are not prime and native Principles; nor are Superſtructures, Foundations. That which is a Foundation for all, cannot be one and another to different Chriſtians, in regard of it ſelf; for then it could be no common Rule for any, nor could the ſouls of men reſt upon a ſhaking Foundation. No, if it be a true Foundation, it muſt be common to all, and firm under all; in which ſenſe the Articles of Chriſtian Faith are Fundamental.* What now do you prove to deſtroy this? You very ſtrenuouſly prove, That if men believe, a *General Council cannot err*, they believe it *cannot err ſo far*, and *no further* than *it cannot err.* But, if you mean any thing further, your meaning is better than your proof: for when you would prove that *to disbelieve the Churches*
P. 16. *Definition, is to disbelieve God's Revelation*; and in order to that confound the *Church and General Councils together*, and from the *General Council's not erring*, infer the former Propoſition, *becauſe, what is teſtified by the Church, is teſtified by an Authority that cannot err*; you do not conſider, that all this while you prove nothing againſt his Lordſhip, unleſs you firſt prove, that whatever is teſtified to be revealed from *God*, is preſently *Fundamental* to all *Churches* and *Chriſtians*, which his Lordſhip utterly denies, by diſtinguiſhing even things which may be teſtified to be revealed from *God*, into ſuch *things* as are common to all Chriſtians to be believed by them, and ſuch things as vary according to the different reſpects of Chriſtians. But yet further, I add, that taking *Fundamentals* in your ſenſe, you prove not the thing you intended, but only to ſuch as do acknowledge, and as far as they do acknowledge, that *General Councils cannot err.* For, they who acknowledge them infallible only in *Fundamentals*, do not judge any thing *Fundamental* by their *Deciſion*, but judge their *Deciſions infallible*, ſo long as they hold to *Fundamentals*; and ſo (for all that I can ſee) leave themſelves *Judges, when General Councils are infallible*, and *when not*: and therefore if they go about to teſtifie any thing as revealed from *God*, which is not Fundamental, they do not believe that their teſtimony cannot err, and ſo are not bound to believe that it is from God. They who believe *General Councils abſolutely infallible*, I do verily think do believe *General Councils infallible in all they ſay*; for that is the ſubſtance of all you ſay. But, what that is to thoſe who neither do, nor can ſee any reaſon to believe them infallible in all they ſay or teſtifie as revealed from God, I neither do, nor can poſſibly underſtand. And, if you hope ſuch kind of Arguments *can ſatisfie your ingenuous Reader*, you ſuppoſe him a *good-natur'd man* in the *Greek* ſenſe of the phraſe.

But all of a ſudden, we find you in a very generous ſtrain, and are contented to take Fundamentals for Fundamentals (which is a huge Conceſſion, and his Lordſhip, were he living, would take it for a ſingular favour from you.) *Yet to deal freely with the Biſhop* (ſay you) *even taking Fundamentals in a General way* (as it ought to be taken only here) *for a thing belonging to the Foundation of Religion* (and it is a ſtrange Fundamental which hath no reſpect to the Foundation, but they who build downwards, muſt

must have their *Foundations* on *tops* of their *houſes.*) *It is alſo manifeſt, that all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental, by reaſon of that formal Object, or infallible Authority, propounding them, though not alwaies by reaſon of the matter which they contain.* The main proof of which lies in this, That *he who doth not believe the Church infallible, can believe nothing at all infallibly, and therefore no Fundamental of Religion; but, if he believe any thing upon the Churches Infallibility, he muſt believe all things on the ſame account of her Infallibility, and therefore muſt believe all equally; and ſo, whatever is propounded by the Church, is to be believed as Fundamental.* This you cannot deny to be the force and ſtrength of your verboſe, and confuſed way of arguing. And therefore I give you a ſhort Anſwer, That I utterly deny the *Infallibility* of any *Church*, to be in any thing the *Foundation* of *Divine* and *Infallible Faith*; as you will find it abundantly proved in the proper place for it, in the *Controverſie of the Reſolution of Faith.* Where it will be largely diſcuſſed, in what ſenſe *Faith* may be ſaid to be *Divine and Infallible*, what the proper *grounds* and *reaſons* of our *believing* are, and how much you impoſe upon the world, in pretending that the Reſolution of *Faith*, is into the *Catholick Churches Infallibility*; whereby it will appear to be far from a Fundamental Error, not to believe on the *Churches Infallibility*, and that he who denies it, will have no reaſon to call into Queſtion the *Canon of Scripture*, or the *Foundations of all Religion.* But, that you rather, by theſe abſurd and unreaſonable pretences of yours, have done your utmoſt to ſhake the true *Foundations* of *Religion*, and advance nothing but *Scepticiſm*, not to ſay *Atheiſm* in the world. Theſe things I take upon me to make good in their proper place, and therefore ſhall not enter the diſcuſſion of them here: but ſince, this is the main, and, in truth, the only *Foundation* of your *Doctrine* of *Fundamentals*, the vanity, falſhood and abſurdity of it, cannot be ſufficiently underſtood, till we have gone through the *Account* of the *Grounds of Faith.* P. 16, 17.

If S. *Auguſtine* make ſome *no Catholick Chriſtians, for holding obſtinately ſome things of no great moment in his Book of Hereſies*; it was, becauſe by *Catholick Chriſtians* he underſtood all ſuch, and only ſuch, as were the members of the *ſound* and *Orthodox* Church, in oppoſition to all kind of *unneceſſary ſeparation* from it upon matters of ſmall moment, and not becauſe he believed the *Churches Infallibility*, in defining all matters of Faith; and that all ſuch things were ſo defined, which men are called *Hereticks* for denying of: unleſs you will ſuppoſe, it was ever infallibly defined, that there were no *Antipodes*; for ſome were accounted *Hereticks* for believing them; and that by ſuch whom you account greater than S. *Auſtin.* But, for S. *Auſtin*, how far it was from his meaning, to have all thoſe accounted *Fundamental Errors*, which he recounts in his Book of *Hereſies*, appears not only from the multitude of particulars mentioned in it, which no one in his ſenſes can acknowledge *Fundamental*, or declared by the *Church* as *neceſſary to be believed by all*, but from his declared ſcope and deſign in the preface to that Book, wherein it appears, he was deſired not only to write the greater errors concerning *Faith*, the *Trinity*, *Baptiſm*, *Repentance*, *Chriſt*, the *Reſurrection*, the *Old and New Teſtament*, *Sed omnia omnino quibus à veritate diſſentiunt*, *i. e.* all kind of errors whatſoever; and do you think that there could then be no error, but it muſt be againſt ſomething then defined by the *Church as neceſſary to Salvation?* If not, then all truths were then *defined by the Church*, and conſequently there could be no new *Definitions* ever ſince; if there might, then thoſe errors mentioned by S. *Auſtin*, were not about matters neceſſary to be believed; and ſo S. *Auſtin*'s Book of *Hereſies* makes nothing for you; but very much againſt you, conſidering that in all that black liſt of *Hereticks*, there are none brought in for denying

ing

ing thoſe grand *Fundamentals* of your *Church*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, your *Churches Infallibility*, nor any of that new brood of *neceſſary* Articles, which were ſo prudently hatcht by the *Council* of *Trent*. But if S. *Auſtin* do you no good, you hope S. *Gegory Nazianzen* may, becauſe he ſaith, *That nothing can be more perillous than thoſe Hereticks, who with a drop of poiſon do infect our Lord's ſincere Faith.* Therefore all things defined by the Church are *Fundamental*. What an excellent Art this *Logick* is, that can fetch out of things that which was never in them! What a rare conſequence is this, *If Hereſie be dangerous*, then, whatever is defined by the *Church*, *is Fundamental:* but it may be, the ſtrength lies in the *drop of poiſon*, as though S. *Gregory* thought a *drop of poiſon* as dangerous as a *whole doſe* of it. But, were I your *Phyſitian*, inſtead of the leaſt *drop* of *poiſon*, I ſhould preſcribe you good ſtore of *Hellebore*, and ſhould hope to ſee the effect of it, in making better conſequences than theſe are. But to ſee yet further, the ſtrange effects that *Logick* hath upon ſome men; for, ſay you, in the proſecution of your proof, that all things defined by the Church are Fundamental. *Hence it is, that Chriſt our Saviour* ſaith, *Matth.* 8. 17. *If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican.* The Argument in form runs thus; Whoſoever deſerves excommunication, is guilty of a Fundamental Error; but he that will not hear the Church, deſerves Excommunication; *ergo*, Or elſe there may be more in it than ſo. For, no doubt, the *Heathens and Publicans* as ſuch, were guilty of Fundamental Errors; therefore they who will not hear the Church, are guilty of as Fundamental Errors as *Heathens and Publicans*. But, before you urge us any more with this dreadful Argument, I pray tell us, What that *Church* is which our Saviour ſpeaks of; what the caſes are, wherein the Church is to be heard; what the full importance is, of being as a *Heathen and Publican*; and you muſt prove this *Church* to be underſtood in your ſenſe of the *Catholick Church*, and that this Church hath hereby power to *define matters of Faith*, and that none can poſſibly in any other ſenſe be accounted as *Heathens and Publicans*, but as guilty of as *Fundamental Errors* as they were.

Your next Objection concerning *giving God and the Church the lye, and preferring and oppoſing a man's private judgement and will before and againſt the Judgement and Will of God and the Church, if men deny or doubt of any thing made known by the Church to be a truth revealed by God*; ſignifies nothing at all, unleſs it be antecedently proved, that the Church can never err in declaring any thing to be a truth revealed by God, which none, who know what you mean by the *Church*, will eaſily aſſent to, till you have attempted a further proof of it, than yet we find. And, although the queſtioning Divine Veracity *be deſtructive to that* which you call *Supernatural Faith*, yet I hope it is poſſible to believe *God to be true*, and yet that *all men are lyars*, or that there is no ſuch inſeparable Connexion between *God's Veracity*, and the *preſent Declarations of any Church*, but that one may heartily aſſent to the former, and yet queſtion the truth of the later. If you think otherwiſe, ſhew your pity to the weakneſs of our underſtandings, by ſomething that may look like a proof of it, which we are ſtill much to ſeek for.

§. 14. But, your greateſt ſtrength, like *Sampſon's*, ſeems to lye there *where one would leaſt ſuſpect it*, viz. *in* Athanaſius *his Creed*. For thus you go on.

P. 18. *Wherefore it is ſaid in S.* Athanaſius *his Creed* (*which is approved in the thirty nine Articles of the pretended Engliſh Church*) *that, Whoſoever will be ſaved, it is neceſſary that he hold the Catholick Faith* ——— *which unleſs every one hold whole and inviolate, without doubt he ſhall periſh for ever: Neither can the Biſhop reply, That all Points expreſſed therein are Fundamental in his ſenſe;*

ſenſe; for (to omit the Article of our Saviours deſcent into Hell) he mentions expreſly the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son, which his Lordſhip hath denied to be a Fundamental Point, as we ſaw in the former Chapter. But, the better to comprehend the force of this Argument, we muſt firſt conſider what it is you intend to prove by it, and then in what way and manner you prove it from this *Creed*. The matter which you are to prove, is, that all things defined by the *Church* are Fundamental, *i. e.* in your ſenſe *neceſſary to Salvation*; and, that the ground why ſuch things, whoſe matter is not neceſſary, do become neceſſary, is, becauſe the Church declares them to be revealed by *God*; now, in order to this, you inſiſt upon the *Creed* commonly call'd *Athanaſius* his, wherein ſome things, acknowledged not to be *Fundamental* in the matter, are yet ſaid to be *neceſſary to Salvation*, and that this is owned by the *Church* of *England*. This is the ſubſtance of the Argument, which being reſolved into its parts, will conſiſt of theſe Propoſitions. 1. That ſome things owned not to be Fundamental in the matter, are yet acknowledged in the *Creed* of *Athanaſius*, to be neceſſary to Salvation. 2. That the reaſon why theſe things do become *neceſſary*, is, becauſe the *Church* hath defined them to be ſo. 3. That this is acknowledged by the *Church* of *England*. And therefore, by parity of reaſon, whatever is defined by the Church, muſt be neceſſary to Salvation. But every one of theſe *Propoſitions* being ambiguous, the clear ſtating of them will be the beſt way of ſolving the difficulty, which ſeems to lye in the preſent Argument. And the main Ambiguity lyes in the meaning of that *neceſſity to Salvation*, which is implied in the *Athanaſian Creed*, as to the Articles therein contained; for, there being different *grounds* and *reaſons* upon which things may be ſuppoſed *neceſſary*, there can be no juſt conſequence made from the general owning a *neceſſity* of the *belief* of ſome things, to the making thoſe things neceſſary to be believed upon one particular account of it. For the *neceſſity* of believing things to Salvation, may ariſe from one of theſe three grounds. 1. The *Suppoſition*, that the matter to be believed is in *it ſelf neceſſary*, this makes it *neceſſary* to all thoſe perſons who are of that perſwaſion; and on this ground it is plain, that the main Articles of the *Athanaſian Creed* are generally ſuppoſed neceſſary, *viz.* thoſe concerning the *Trinity in Unity*, the *Incarnation*, *Reſurrection*, and *Eternal Life*, &c. Now theſe being ſuppoſed to be neceſſary from the *Matter*, any Church may own them under this degree of *neceſſity*, in that expreſſion uſed in ſeveral places of the *Athanaſian Creed*, *Whoſoever will be ſaved, it is neceſſary that he hold the Catholick Faith* —— *which Catholick Faith is*, &c. But then we are to conſider, that this is only a Declaration of the ſenſe of that *Church*, what things ſhe owns as *neceſſary*, and what not. And this Declaration doth not oblige the Conſcience of particular perſons any further, than as the Articles of that *Church* are required to be owned as the *conditions* of *Communion* with her, *i. e.* where the *degree* of *neceſſity* is not declared, nor expreſly owned by a Church, but left in general terms; no man is bound to *believe* the things judged as *neceſſary*, with any particular kind of *neceſſity* excluſive of others, but only that the *Church* in *General* may uſe that *Creed* ſuppoſed neceſſary, and that the Uſe of that *Creed* is a lawful condition of that *Churches Communion*. 2. The belief of a thing may be ſuppoſed *neceſſary*, becauſe of the clear *Conviction* of mens underſtandings, that though the matters be not in themſelves neceſſary, yet being *revealed by God*, they muſt be explicitly believed; but then the *neceſſity* of this Belief doth extend no further than the *clearneſs* of that Conviction doth. As, ſuppoſe it inſerted into a *Creed*, that the Article of the *Deſcent* muſt be underſtood according to the ſenſe of the *Scriptures*, this doth oblige no man to any further neceſſity

of belief of the ſenſe of the Article, than he is convinced, that it is the *ſenſe* of the *Scriptures*; And the caſe is the ſame, when the Article is expreſſed only in general terms, which are known to be capable of very different *ſenſes*, when none of which are expreſſed, no particular ſenſe can be ſaid to be *neceſſary to Salvation*, to particular perſons, but only that *ſenſe* in general, which all muſt agree in who own it, and the particulars are left to the *Convictions* of mens underſtandings upon the uſe of the beſt means of ſatisfaction. So that he that believes fully that the meaning of this Article from *Scripture*, is, that *Chriſt's ſoul* did locally deſcend to Hell, it is neceſſary for him to believe ſo, upon ſuch Conviction; but he that ſees no more neceſſary to be believed by it, but that *Chriſt's ſoul* was, during his Body's lying in the grave, in a *ſtate of Separation* from it; how can you prove it neceſſary to Salvation for him to believe any more than this? And the caſe is the ſame as to all *Modes* of *Exiſtence*, and particular explications of Articles in themſelves owned, as of the different *Subſiſtences in the Trinity*, the manner of the *Hypoſtatical Union* of the *two Natures in Chriſt's Perſon*, ſuppoſing the Doctrines themſelves believed, what reaſon can there be to aſſert it neceſſary to Salvation to all perſons, to believe them under ſuch a ſenſe, if the Article may be it ſelf believed without it, any further than as things under thoſe explications, are manifeſted to ſuch perſons to be neceſſary to be believed? As *Leo* 3. defined in the Article of the *Holy Ghoſt's Proceſſion from the Son*, To ſuch, who by reaſon of capacity and apprehenſion, could attain to the Knowledge of it, it was neceſſary to be believed, but not by others; as appears in our former Diſcourſe on that Subject. Therefore from hence we ſee another account, why things may become neceſſary to be believed and owned as ſuch, beſides the matter and the Churches Definition. Theſe things may be ſaid to be neceſſary to be *believed* by ſuch, who believe the Churches Propoſition to be ſufficient, though it be not; as, ſuppoſe any member of the *Greek Church* ſhould believe their Church infallible, it is neceſſary, for ſuch a one to believe whatever is propounded by that *Church*, though you ſuppoſe that judgement of his to be falſe in it ſelf, becauſe you ſay, the *Greek Church* is not infallible. So that from hence it appears, that the *neceſſity* ariſing from the *Churches* Definition, doth depend upon the Conviction, that whatever the *Church* defines, is neceſſary to be believed. And, where that is not received as an antecedent principle, the other cannot be ſuppoſed. By this opening the ſeveral grounds of *neceſſity*, your difficulty concerning the *Athanaſian Creed* comes to nothing: For granting, that the *Church* of *England* doth own and approve the *Creed*, going under the name of *Athanaſius*, and ſuppoſing that her *Uſe* of the *Creed*, doth extend to the owning of thoſe expreſſions, which import the *neceſſity* of believing the things therein contained in order to Salvation; yet this doth not reach to your purpoſe, unleſs you prove that the *Church* of *England* doth own that *neceſſity* purely on the account of the *Churches Definition* of thoſe things which are not *Fundamental*, which it is very unreaſonable to imagine; it being directly contrary to her ſenſe in her nineteenth and twentieth Articles. And thence, that ſuppoſed *neceſſity* of the belief of the Articles of the *Athanaſian Creed*, muſt, according to the ſenſe of the *Church* of *England*, be reſolved either into the *neceſſity* of the *Matters*, or into that *neceſſity* which ſuppoſeth *clear Convictions*, that the things therein contained are of *Divine Revelation*. From hence then it cannot at all follow, becauſe the *Church* of *England* owns the *Creed* of *Athanaſius*, therefore all things defined by the *Church* are, *eo nomine*, *neceſſary to Salvation*. Other particulars concerning that *Creed*, as to its *Antiquity and Authority*, we may have occaſion afterwards more at large to diſcuſs; it ſuffi-

ceth

ceth now, that nothing is thence produced pertinent to the preſent Controverſie.

His Lordſhip, in the progreſs of this Diſcourſe, takes away that ſlight and poor evaſion, *That the Declaration of the Church makes any thing Fundamental*, quoad nos, *becauſe that no reſpect to us can vary the Foundation. And that the Churches Declaration can bind us only to peace and external obedience, where there is not expreſs letter of Scripture and ſenſe agreed on: but it cannot make any thing Fundamental to us, that is not ſo in its own nature. For*, ſaith he, *if the Church can ſo add, that it can by a Declaration make a thing to be Fundamental in the Faith that was not, then it can take a thing away from the Foundation, and make it by declaring not to be — Fundamental, which all men grant no power of the Church can do. For the power of adding any thing contrary, and of detracting any thing neceſſary, are alike forbidden, and alike denied.* Now you ſay, *That all this is ſatisfied by the foreſaid diſtinction, of material and formal Object*; and you deſire the Reader *to carry along with him this diſtinction of* objectum materiale & formale, materia atteſtata; & authoritas atteſtantis, *and he will eaſily diſcover the fallacies of his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe, in this main Point of Controverſie, and ſolve all his difficulties ſupported by them.* No doubt, an excellent *Amulet* to preſerve from the infection of reaſon! But it is your great miſhap, that where you commend it ſo much, it doth you ſo little ſervice: For, let your diſtinction of *formal and material Object*, be ſuppoſed as ſound and good, as I have ſhewed, it in your ſenſe, to be falſe and fallacious; yet it doth not reach that part of his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe, which you apply it to. For, ſtill his reaſon is concluſive, though the neceſſity only be ſuppoſed to ariſe from the *Churches Authority*, yet if it be in the power of the *Church*, to make any thing neceſſary which was not, why may it not be equally in her power to make ſomething not neceſſary which was? For, either the grounds of the neceſſity of things to Salvation, doth depend on the Doctrine of the *Goſpel*, as at firſt declared to the world, or it doth not. If it doth, then it is not in the *Churches Power* to make any thing neceſſary, which was not made neceſſary by it; if it doth not, then the *Church* may as well pretend to a power to make ſomething *not neceſſary*, which was; as to make ſomething neceſſary, which was not. So that your diſtinction of *Formal and Material Object*, ſignifies nothing at all here; only this is obſervable, that you make the *Churches Definition* to be the *Formal Object of Faith* here, which you very ſolemnly contradict afterwards. (*Cap.* 5. §. 4.) And can any thing be more evident from this Diſcourſe of yours, than that you make the laſt reſolution of Faith, as to the neceſſity of things to be believed into the *Churches Definition*, as its Formal Object? But this diſtinction with the grounds of it being removed in our former Diſcourſe, I ſhall eaſe my ſelf and the Reader of any further labour in examining what follows in this Chapter, which depends wholly upon it; or elſe run out into *the Churches Infallibility, the infallible Aſſent requiſite to Faith, the Canon of Scripture, and our certainty* of it, or *the Authority of General Councils*; all which ſhall be fully and particularly examined in their proper places. There being nothing ſaid here, but what either hath been anſwered already, or will be more at large in a more convenient place.

§. 15. N. 8. p. 31, 32. P. 18. P. 19, 20, 21.

The only things remaining then in this Chapter, which deſerve a further diſcuſſion here, are the teſtimonies of *Scotus* and S. *Auſtin*, and the Diſcourſes which depend thereon. For our better clearing the teſtimony of *Scotus*, *in which you charge his Lordſhip with falſification*, we muſt conſider on what account, and for what purpoſes that teſtimony is produced. His Lordſhip had ſaid before, *That Fundamentals are a Rock immovable, and can never be varied; therefore what is Fundamental after the Church*

§. 16. P. 29. n. 5.

hath defined it, was Fundamental before the definition, and no Decrees of Councils, how general ſoever, can alter immovable Verities; wherefore, if the Church in a Council define any thing, the thing defined is not fundamental becauſe the Church hath defined it; nor can be made ſo by the definition of the Church, if it be not ſo in it ſelf. For if the Church hath this power, ſhe might make a New Article of Faith, which the learned among themſelves deny. For the Articles of Faith cannot increaſe in ſubſtance, but only in explication: For which
N. 2. *he appeals to* Bellarmin. *Nor,* ſaith he, *Is this hard to be further proved out of your own School. For* Scotus *profeſſeth it in this very particular of the Greek Church. If there be,* ſaith he, *a true real difference between the Greeks and Latins about the Point of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, then either they or we be,* verè hæretici, *truly and indeed Hereticks. Which he ſpeaks of the old Greeks long before any deciſion of the Church in this Controverſie. For he inſtances in S.* Baſil, *and* Greg. Nazianzen, *on one ſide; and S.* Jerome, Auguſtine, *and* Ambroſe, *on the other. And who dares call any of theſe Hereticks is his challenge?* That then which his Lordſhip proves by this teſtimony, is, that the *nature of Hereſie* doth not depend on the *Churches Definition*, but on the *Nature of the thing*; for, according to *Scotus*, antecedently to the *Churches Definition*, if there had been any real difference between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, one ſide of them had been *Hereticks*. To
P. 21. this you anſwer, *That hence it follows not, that* Scotus *thought they could be Hereticks, unleſs they denyed or doubted of that which they had reaſon to believe was revealed by God: But it only follows, that if they knew this (as thoſe learned Greeks had ſufficient reaſon to know it) they might well be eſteemed Hereticks, before any ſpecial Declaration of the Church; although it be more clear, that he is an Heretick, who denies to believe that Doctrine, after he confeſſes that it is defined by the Church.* From which anſwer of yours, ſeveral things are to our purpoſe obſervable. 1. That the *Formal Reaſon* of *Hereſie*, is, denying ſomething ſuppoſed to be of *Divine Revelation*. 2. That none can reaſonably be accuſed of *Hereſie*, but ſuch as have ſufficient reaſon to believe that which they deny is *revealed by God*. 3. That none can be guilty of *Hereſie*, for denying any thing *declared by the Church*; unleſs they have ſufficient reaſon to believe, that whatever is declared by the *Church*, is *revealed by God*. Which unavoidably follows from the former, and therefore the *Churches Definition* cannot make any *Hereticks*, but ſuch as have reaſon to believe that ſhe cannot err in her *Definitions*. From whence *Proteſtants* will be in leſs danger of *Hereſie* than *Papiſts*, till you give us more ſufficient reaſons to prove, that whatever the *Church declares*, is certainly *revealed by God*. And, although you tell us, *Men may be accounted Hereticks before they are condemned as ſuch by General Councils, if they oppoſe the Doctrine clearly contained in Scripture, or generally received by the Church*; yet you tell us not, what the meaſures are, whereby we ought to judge what things are thus clearly contained in Scripture, or univerſally received; whether the *Churches judgement* muſt be taken, or every man's own judgement: if the former, the ground of *Hereſie* lies ſtill in the *Churches Definition*, contrary to what *Scotus* affirms; if the later, then no one can be an *Heretick*, but he that oppoſeth that which he is or may be convinced, is clearly contained in Scripture, or generally received by the Church. If *that which he is convinced*, then no man is an *Heretick*, but he that goes againſt his preſent judgement, and ſo there will be few *Hereticks* in the world; *If that which he may be convinced of*, it muſt be underſtood either in *his* own judgement, or *yours*; if in *his own* judgement, then a *Heretick* is one who aſſents to things *raſhly*, without uſing means to inform himſelf: if in *yours*, why may not he ſay, You may as well be convinced of the *truth* of that which he believes, as he be convinced of the truth

truth of that which you believe; and ſo you may be a *Heretick* to him by the ſame reaſon that he is to you. But you ſay further, *that there are many things, which in themſelves are matters of Faith; yet ſo obſcure, in relation eſpecially to unlearned and particular perſons, that before the decree of the Church, we are not Hereticks, though we ſhould either doubt of them, or deny them: becauſe, as yet, there appears no ſufficient reaſon that can oblige us to believe them; although, after the Definition of the Church, we ought as well to believe them as any other.* But it is impoſſible to underſtand how there can be ſuch things which men might ſafely not believe, but upon the Definition of the Church they are bound to believe them neceſſarily, unleſs it be clear to them, that the Church hath power to make obſcure things plain, and unneceſſary things to become neceſſary. For, ſuppoſe one of theſe *obſcure things* be this very *Power* of the *Church in defining* ſuch things, while this remains ſo *obſcure*, you tell me I may doubt or disbelieve it without Hereſie, and while I do ſo, I may certainly doubt or disbelieve all ſhe declares. But, by what means ſhall this thing become *clear*? muſt it be by the *Churches* defining it? But that very *Power* of *defining*, is the thing in queſtion, and therefore cannot be cleared by it. And if there be any thing then ſo obſcure, that men may without ſin doubt of it, or disbelieve it, certainly the *Churches Power in defining matters of Faith*, is ſuch; it being not capable, by any act of the *Church*, of being made ſo clear, as to oblige men to believe it.

But we muſt ſee how his *Lordſhip* hath wronged the *Teſtimony* of *Scotus*: *For firſt*, ſay you, *He would perſwade his Reader, that this Author ſuppoſed a real difference between the Ancient Greek and Latin Fathers, about the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; whereas* Scotus *declares, that there was no real difference between them:* But doth his Lordſhip ſay, there was? doth he not expreſly cite *Scotus* his teſtimony in an hypothetical manner; *If there be a true real difference, &c.* and it is evident from *Scotus* his words, that he ſuppoſeth, *If the difference had been real, that either the Greeks or Latins were truly Hereticks.* And therefore you are guilty of a much greater injury to his *Lordſhip* than he was to *Scotus*. Again, you ſay, *He wrongs him, in ſaying, That after the Churches Definition, it becomes of the ſubſtance of Faith.* Now, ſay you, Scotus *hath not one word of the ſubſtance of Faith, much leſs of Fundamental, which he impoſes preſently upon him, but ſayes only thus,* Ex quo Eccleſia declaravit hoc eſſe tenendum, &c. tenendum eſt, quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat ab utroque, *Since the Church hath ſo declared, ſo it muſt be held.* Sure you never expect to be believed, but by a very implicit Faith; for if one doth but offer to ſearch an Author, your Jugling becomes notorious. Had you the confidence to ſay, That *Scotus* has not one word of the *ſubſtance of Faith*; I pray who made that, *&c.* for you in the ſentence? If you did it your ſelf, you *abuſe* your Readers; if another did it for you, he *abuſed* you: For that very, *&c.* leaves out thoſe words, *ſicut de ſubſtantia fidei*, and try if you can render that otherwiſe, than *as of the ſubſtance of Faith*; to manifeſt your *Forgery*, the whole place is cited in the Margin. Is this your fidelity in quoting Authors, even when you charge others with wronging them? It may be you will ſay yet, That *Scotus doth not ſay, it is to be held*, ſicut de ſubſtantia fidei, though it be declared by the Church to be ſo held! But what means then the *ex quo*, if men's Faith muſt not be guided by the *Churches Declaration*: for if it be therefore to be believed neceſſarily, becauſe declared by the Church, it muſt be believed as it is declared by the Church: If therefore the Church declares that it is to be held *as of the ſubſtance of Faith*, it ought to be held ſo by

Pateret utiq; tandem, ipſam contrarietatem non eſſe veraciter realem ſicut eſt vocalis; alioquin vel ipſi Græci, vel nos Latini famus vere hæretici. Scotus Diſt. 11. l. 1. q. 1. ſect. 2.

Quicquid ſit de iis ex quo Eccleſia Catholica declarat it hoc eſſe tenendum, ſicut de ſubſtantia fidei, ſicut patet extra. de ſumm. Trin. & fid. Cathol. ſimiter tenendum eſt quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat ab utroq. Scotus. ib.

by ſuch as are bound to believe it on the Churches Declaration. Beſides, you will not ſay, but that it was to be believed before; now, what alteration is cauſed by the Declaration of the Church, but this, That which was before to be believed ſimply and in it ſelf, is now to be believed on the account of the Churches Declaration, as of the ſubſtance of Faith. And thus it is impoſſible to relieve your ſelf with your old ſhift of *Material and Formal Object*, which you betake your ſelf to. Thus ſtill we ſee you are that moſt unhappy perſon, who never begin a charge againſt your adverſary, but it falls back moſt unevitably upon your ſelf, who ſo readily make uſe of forgeries, to prove others guilty of them.

§. 17. P. 31. n. 7. Upon *Scotus* his mentioning the *Churches Declaration*, his *Lordſhip* inquires, *What this Declaration is, and how far it extends.* For which, his Lordſhip ſaith, *The Maſter teacheth, and his Scholars too, that every thing which belongs to the Expoſition or Declaration of another*, intus eſt, *is not another contrary thing, but is contained within the bowels and nature of that which is interpreted: from which, if the Declaration depart, it is faulty and erronious, becauſe, inſtead of declaring, it gives another and contrary ſenſe. Therefore when the Church declares any thing in Council, either that which ſhe declares was* intus *or* extra; *in the nature and verity of the thing, or out of it. If it were* extra, *without the nature of the thing declared, then the Declaration of the thing is falſe; and ſo far from being Fundamental in the Faith. If it were* intus, *within the nature and compaſs of the thing, though not open and apparent to every eye; then the Declaration is true, but not otherwiſe Fundamental than the thing is which is declared: for that which is* intus, *cannot be larger or deeper, than that in which it is; if it were, it could not be* intus. *Therefore nothing is ſimply Fundamental, becauſe the Church declares it; but becauſe it is ſo, in the nature of the thing which the Church declares.* In anſwer to this, you ſeem more ingenuous than uſual; for you acknowledge, *that his expreſſion is learnedly ſolid and good:* but yet you would ſeem to return ſome anſwer P. 23. to this Argument, *viz. although there be no alteration in the nature of the Artcles by the Churches Declaration; yet this doth not hinder them from becoming Fundamental in that ſenſe in which we diſpute*, i. e. *ſuch as cannot be denied or doubted of under pain of damnation, although they were not thus Fundamental before the Declaration, as not being ſo clearly propoſed to us, as that we were bound to believe them. Neither doth this take away any thing from their* intus, *or that being which they had of themſelves; but only gives a certainty of their being ſo, and declares that they ought to be ſo* quoad nos, *as well as* quoad ſe, *and internally. And it is no evaſion, but a ſolid diſtinction, that the Declaration of the* P. 24. *Church varies not the thing in it ſelf, but* quoad nos *in its reſpect to us.* The ſubſtance of your Anſwer lyes in this, That though the *Church* by her Declaration, doth not alter the nature of things, yet ſhe may, and doth, our *Obligation to believe* them; ſo that ſuch things which men might have been ſaved without believing before, when once the Church hath declared them, become neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation. And P. 20. n. 8. yet you would not have this called *making new Articles of Faith*: But I pray tell us, what you mean by *Articles of Faith*; are not thoſe properly Articles of Faith, as diſtinct from *Theological Verities*, which are neceſſary to be believed by all? If therefore thoſe things which the Church declares, were before not neceſſary, and by the *Churches Declaration* do become neceſſary; then certainly thoſe things which were not *Articles of Faith*, do become Articles of Faith, and what then doth the Church by her Declaration, but make New Articles of Faith? But, though you aſſert the thing, you like not the terms, becauſe they do not ſound ſo pleaſantly to the ears of Chriſtians, who believe all *Obligation to Faith* doth depend upon immediate Divine Revelation. Setting aſide therefore the terms,

terms, let us examine the thing, to ſee upon what grounds the *Church* can make that neceſſary to us, which was not in it ſelf. In which caſe the *Obligation* not ariſing from the neceſſity of the *Matter* in it ſelf to be believed, it is no otherwiſe intelligible, but that it muſt reſult from the ſuppoſition of ſome *Immediate Revelation*. For nothing elſe can bind us to an *Internal Aſſent*, which you require as neceſſary to the Churches Definitions but that, unleſs you can ſhew how any Society of men conſidered as ſuch, have power to *oblige* all other men to believe what they declare on pain of damnation for not doing it. I pray tell me, whether the *Apoſtles* themſelves had power to bind all *Chriſtians* to the belief of ſomething as neceſſary, which the *Spirit of God* did not immediately reveal to them to be ſo? If not, what power can any *Church* have to do it, without a greater meaſure of *Infallibility*, than the *Apoſtles* ever pretended to? For, they never attempted to define any thing as neceſſary, which was ſuppoſed unneceſſary to be believed after the *Doctrine* of the *Goſpel* was declared to the world. Before then you can perſwade us to believe that your *Church* can make any thing *neceſſary*, which was *not ſo*, you muſt prove an *Abſolute Infallible Divine Aſſiſtance of God's Spirit* with your *Church*, in whatever ſhe ſhall attempt to declare or define as matter of Faith. As for inſtance, ſuppoſing it not neceſſary to Salvation in it ſelf to believe the *Immaculate Conception* of the *Virgin Mary*, how is it poſſible to conceive, after your *Churches Definition* of it, it ſhould become neceſſary, unleſs it be ſuppoſed that there was an *Immediate Divine Revelation*, in that Definition. For, nothing but *Divine Authority* commanding our Aſſent, the ground of Faith muſt be reſolved into that. Now in this caſe, beſides the Immediate Aſſent to the thing declared as a truth, there is a diſtinct Propoſition to be *believed*, which is, That *what was not before neceſſary to be believed, doth now become neceſſary to be believed by all*; and ſhew us, either that there is *Divine Revelation* for this, or elſe excuſe us, that we cannot give an *Internal Aſſent* to it. For, we have not learnt to give an Aſſent of Faith to a meer humane propoſition, or, in our *Saviour's* words, we call no man, *Maſter upon Earth*, ſo as to promiſe to believe it in the power of any Church whatſoever, to make any thing neceſſary to be believed, which was not ſo before. Hence it appears, that your Diſtinction of, *in ſe*, *& quoad nos*, is as inſignificant, as your pretence of the Churches Power to define matters of Faith is preſumptuous and arrogant, being the higheſt degree of *Lording it over the Chriſtian world*.

Why your Church may not as well declare ſomething not to be of *Faith*, which before was of Faith, as declare ſomething to be of Faith which before was not of Faith, it is not eaſie to apprehend, if that thing might be ſuppoſed of Faith before, without the Churches explicit Declaration. For in that caſe the Church would not ſo apparently contradict her ſelf; for that *Contradiction* doth not lye in varying the reſpects of things, but in one Declaration contradicting another. For otherwiſe, it is as great a contradiction to ſay, That ſomething which was not neceſſary, is become neceſſary; as that a thing which was neceſſary, is become not neceſſary. Therefore if there be a contradiction in one, there is in the other. If the Contradiction lyes in the *Declaration*, you muſt ſay, That nothing could be ſuppoſed neceſſary to be *believed*, but what was declared by the *Church* to be ſo, and as declared by the *Church*: which is a Province as difficult as neceſſary to be undertaken, to rid your hands of this difficulty. For otherwiſe, that Anſwer of yours cannot reach the Objection. P. 24.

And now we come to that *Teſtimony* of S. *Auguſtine*, which was produced

duced to prove, *That all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental*: Which ſay, *It is a thing founded. An erring Diſputant is to be born with in other Queſtions, not diligently digeſted, not yet made firm by full Authority of the Church; there errour is to be born with: but it ought not to proceed ſo far, that it ſhould labour to ſhake the Foundation it ſelf of the Church.* Now to this place his Lordſhip anſwers.

Fundata iſta res eſt; ferendus eſt diſputator errans in aliis quæſtionibus, non diligenter digeſtis, nondum plena eccleſiæ autoritate firmatis, ibi ferendus eſt error: non tantum progredi debet, ut etiam Fundamentum ipſum Eccleſiæ quatere moliatur. Auguſt. ſerm. 14. de verb. Apoſtol. Tom. 10. p. 224. edit. Froben. 1529.

1. *He ſpeaks of a Foundation of Doctrine in Scripture, not of a Church-Definition*: *This appears*, ſaith he, *For few lines before, he tells us, There was a Queſtion moved to S.* Cyprian, *Whether Baptiſm was concluded to the eighth day, as well as Circumciſion? and no doubt was made then of the beginning of ſin; and that out of this thing, about which no Queſtion was moved, that Queſtion that was made was anſwered. And again, that S.* Cyprian *took that which he gave in Anſwer from the Foundation of the Church, to confirm a Stone that was ſhaking. Now S.* Cyprian *in all the Anſwer that he gives, hath not one word of any definition of the Church: therefore* ea res, *that thing by which he anſwered was a Foundation of prime and ſetled Scripture-Doctrine not any Definition of the Church: Therefore that which he took out of the Foundation of the Church, to faſten the Stone that ſhook, was not Definition of the Church, but the Foundation of the Church it ſelf, the Scripture upon which it is builded; as appeareth in the* Milevitane *Councils; where the Rule by which* Pelagius *was condemned, is the Rule of Scripture. Therefore S.* Auguſtine *goes on in the ſame ſenſe, that the Diſputer is not to be born any longer, that ſhall endeavour to ſhake the Foundation it ſelf, upon which the whole Church is grounded.*

P. 32, 33. n. 9, 10.

2. His Lordſhip anſwers, *That granting that the Churches Definition, was meant by S.* Auſtin, *yet it can never follow out of any, or all theſe Circumſtances, that all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental, becauſe this Foundation may be upon Humane Authority; and that which follows, only is, That things are not to be oppoſed, which are made firm by full Authority of the Church; but it cannot be thence concluded, They are therefore Fundamental in the Faith.* This is the ſubſtance of his Lordſhips Anſwer to this place; which we muſt conſider what you reply to. Firſt, you ſay, *That it cannot be doubted but that S.* Auſtin's *judgement was, that all our Faith depended on the Authority of the Church, and therefore that he that oppoſeth himſelf againſt this, endeavoureth to ſhake and deſtroy the very ground-work of all Divine Supernatural Faith.* This is a rare way of ſilencing Adverſaries, by telling them, *That cannot be doubted*, which o[illegible] can ſee no reaſon at all to believe. As in this preſent caſe you tell me, that cannot be doubted, which I utterly deny, *viz.* That S. *Auſtin's* judgement was, that all our *Faith* depended on the *Authority of the Church*; and if all the proof you have for it, be only that well-known place, *Ergo verò Evangelio non crederem, &c.* You ſhall in time ſee, what an ill choice you made of fixing your proof wholly upon that. But whoever is never ſo little converſant in S. *Auguſtin*'s way of diſputing either againſt the *Donatiſts*, *Pelagians*, or *Manichees*, will find very little reaſon to doubt, but that he made the *Foundation of Faith*, to be *God's Word*, and not the *Authority* of the *Church*. Indeed S. *Auſtin*, by way of *Preſcription*, often makes uſe of the *Churches Authority*, not where there hath been particular *Definitions*, but *Univerſal Conſent*, which he underſtands by the ſettlement, by *full Authority of the Church*; but this he inſiſts not on as the ground of Faith, but to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of mens oppoſing thoſe things which the *Univerſal Church* was agreed in, as in this Controverſie here diſputed by him concerning *Original Sin in Infants*. Therefore if I underſtand S. *Auſtin* in this place, he doth not at all ſpeak concerning what is to be owned as a matter of Faith ſimply in it ſelf, but what the *Churches Carriage* towards

Pag. 25.

wards Diſſenters is. For after that *Citation* of S. *Cyprian* at the Concluſion of his Sermon, he addreſſeth himſelf to the *Pelagians*, as his diſſenting Brethren; Therefore, ſaith he, *Let us, if poſſible, intreat this of our Brethren, That they would no longer call us Hereticks; becauſe we might as well call them ſo if we would, but we do not.* Why was S. *Auſtin* ſo ſcrupulous of calling the *Pelagians Hereticks*, if he made the *Definition* of the *Church* the Foundation of Faith, and looked on this Controverſie as defined by full Authority of the *Church*? And after, ſpeaks of the *Churches* bearing with them ſtill, in order to their inſtruction; though they were gone ſo far, that they were ſcarce to be born with; and that the *Church* exerciſed great patience towards them; therefore intreats them not to abuſe this *patience* of the *Church*, but to be *reformed*, ſince they did exhort as *Friends*, and not contend as enemies. And ſo brings in the former words, which I thus paraphraſe; *It is a thing to be taken for granted, that in diſputable Points, and ſuch as the Church hath not always been agreed in, diſſenters may be born with: but if direct and full oppoſition to the clear ſenſe of the Church ſhould ſtill be ſuffered, it would overthrow the very Foundation of the Church it ſelf.* And that this, and no other, is the plain and genuine meaning of S. *Auſtin*, is evident to any one who impartially conſiders antecedents and conſequents, and the natural ſenſe of the words themſelves. Before, he ſpake how far the Church had born with them: in the words themſelves, he tells them, They muſt not expect the *Church* would always bear with them, if they joined *Obſtinacy* with their *Errours*, for that would ruine the *Church*, if ſhe continually ſuffered ſuch as violently oppoſed things contrary to her cleareſt ſenſe: and after tells them, *This is not expedient: for hitherto, it may be, our patience is not to be found fault withal; but we ought likewiſe to fear, leſt we be blamed for our negligence:* Which words immediately follow the former. And is not this now a rare conſequence, If the *Church* muſt not always bear with ſuch as oppoſe her, then whatſoever is defined by the Church is Fundamental? For it is moſt evident, S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks not of the *Churches Power*, in defining matters of Fath, but of the *Churches proceeding with Obſtinate Hereticks*. And therefore the *Foundation* ſpoken of, is not the *Foundation* of her *Belief*, but of her *Communion*; which the continual bearing with ſuch obſtinate perſons as the *Pelagians* were, would in time overthrow. The want of underſtanding this to be S. *Auguſtine*'s meaning, hath made you ſpend many words to very little purpoſe, ſuppoſing all along that he ſpeaks of the *Churches Definition*, and not her proceedings. Your Reply to his Lordſhips ſecond Anſwer, runs upon the ſame miſtake, that he ſpeaks of *Shaking the Foundation of Faith*, whereas I have already ſhewed, that he ſpeaks of no ſuch thing, and therefore that, as well as the former Anſwer, fall to the ground together, being both built on the ſame *miſtaken Foundation*.

Impetremus ergo, ſi poſſumus, à fratribus noſtris, nè nos inſuper appellent Hæreticos; quod eos talia diſputantes nos appellare poſſimus forſitan, ſi vellemus, nec tamen appellamus, Id. ib.

Non expedit: adhuc fortè noſtra non eſt reprehendenda patientia; ſed debemus timere, ne culpetur etiam negligentia.

CHAP. III.

The Abſurdities of the *Romaniſts* Doctrine of Fundamentals.

The Churches Authority muſt be Divine, if whatever ſhe defines be Fundamental. His Lordſhip, and not the Teſtimony of S. Auguſtine, *ſhamefully abuſed, three ſeveral ways.* Bellarmine *not miſ-cited; the* Pelagian *Hereſie condemned by the General Council at* Epheſus. *The Popes Authority not implyed in that of Councils. The groſs Abſurdities of the diſtinction of the Church teaching and repreſentative, from the Church taught and diffuſive, in the Queſtion of Fundamentals. The Churches Authority and Teſtimony in matters of Faith, diſtinguiſhed. The Teſtimonies of* Vincentius Lerinenſis *explained, and ſhewed to be directly contrary to the* Roman *Doctrine of Fundamentals.* Stapleton *and* Bellarmine *not reconciled by the vain endeavours uſed to that end.*

§. 1. THe main Doctrine of *Fundamentals* being in the foregoing Chapter ſetled and cleared, what remains of that ſubject will be capable of a quicker diſpatch. The ſcope of this *Chapter*, is, to aſſoil thoſe difficulties, which your doctrine of *Fundamentals* is ſubject to. What little footing that hath in the place of S. *Auguſtine*, was the laſt thing diſcuſſed in the preceeding Chapter; and therefore muſt not be repeated here. His Lordſhip urgeth this reaſon why *S. Auguſtine*, or any other reaſonable man could not
P. 34. n. 11. believe, that whatever is defined by the Church is *Fundamental in the Faith; becauſe full Church-Authority (always the time that included the Holy Apoſtles being paſt by, and not comprehended in it) is but Church-Authority; and Church-Authority, when it is at full Sea, is not ſimply divine; therefore the ſentence of it not Fundamental in the Faith.* To this you very wiſely and learnedly an-
P. 28. n. 1. ſwer; *I will not diſpute with his Lordſhip, whether it be, or no; becauſe it is ſufficient that ſuch Authority be infallible. For if it be infallible, it cannot propoſe to us any thing as revealed by God, but what is ſo revealed. So that to diſpute againſt this Authority, is in effect to take away all Authority from divine Revelation; we having no other abſolute certainty, that this or that is revealed by God, but only the Infallibility of the Church propoſing, or atteſting, it unto us as revealed. Whence alſo it follows, that to doubt, diſpute againſt, or deny any thing that is propoſed by the Infallible Authority of the Church, is to doubt, diſpute againſt, and deny that which is Fundamental in Faith.* His Lordſhip denies the ſentence of the Church to be Fundamental in the Faith, becauſe *not Divine*; you dare not ſay, It is *Divine*, but contend that it is *Infallible*, and from that Infallibility inferr, That *Whoſoever denies the Churches Infallibility, muſt deny ſomething Fundamental in the Faith, becauſe we can have no other abſolute certainty that any thing is revealed by God, but only from the Churches Infallibility.* So that your whole proof reſts upon a very rotten and uncertain Foundation, *viz.* that all *certainty* in matters of Faith, doth depend upon the *Churches Infallibility*; the falſhood and unreaſonableneſs of which principle, will at large be diſcovered in the ſucceeding Controverſie. And if this fails, then the denial of the Churches Infallibility doth not inferr the denial of any thing *Fundamental* in the Faith, becauſe men may be certain of all *Fundamentals*, without believing this Infallibility. But yet, ſay you, *There is no neceſſity of aſſerting Church-Authority to be Divine, but only to be infallible, in order to the making what ſhe defines to be Fundamental.* A rare and excellent piece of your old *Theological Reaſon*! as though any thing could be any further *Infallible* than it is *Divine*, or any further

further owned to be *Divine*, than as it is *Infallible*. I pray, acquaint us with these rare Arts of distinguishing between an Authority *Divine* and *Infallible*, when the ground of that *Infallibility*, is the supposition of something properly and simply *Divine*, which is the *Infallible Assistance* of *God's Spirit*. Is that Assistance *Infallible* too, but not *Divine*? If it be *Divine*, as well as *Infallible*, how comes that *Infallibility* which flows from it not to be *Divine*, when the cause of it was simply and absolutely so? Besides, what *Infallible Authority* is that which makes all its *Definitions Fundamental*, and yet is not in it self *Divine*? From whence comes any thing to be *Fundamental*? You tell us your self, *as it is known to be revealed by God*. And can any thing be known to be revealed by God, but by an *Authority Divine*? especially on your principles, who make all certainty of knowing it to depend on that Churches Authority? If so, then since the Churches sentence makes things become matters of Faith, some things may become matters of Faith, which have no *Divine Authority* for them. But this excellent and subtle distinction between *Divine* and *Infallible Authority*, we shall have occasion to examine afterwards. And therefore it is well you tell us, *Notwithstanding that Infallible and Divine, seem to many great Divines to be terms convertible*, which only acquaints us with thus much, that there are some men who understand things better than you do; and that to do so, is to be a *great Divine*. And if *Stapleton* be one of these, we are not much offended at it; and so far we will take the Testimonies which you produce out of him.—That which next follows depends upon the proof of the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, which when you have sufficiently cleared, we will believe that there can be no plain *Scripture*, or *Evident Reason* against any of their *Definitions*, but till then we must believe there may be room for both.

§. 2. Your next *Section* promiseth to shew us *a shameful abuse of S.* Augustine's *Testimony three several ways*; But, if it appears, that not one of those ways will hold, then it only follows, that so many ways *you* have abused his *Lordship*, and not *he* S. *Augustine*. His *Lordship* having affirmed, P. 32. n. 11. *That plain Scripture with evident sense, or a full demonstrative Argument, must have room, where a wrangling and erring Disputer may not be allowed it. And there's neither of these but may convince the Definition of the Council, if it be ill founded.* Over against these words he cites that sentence of S. *Austin*; *Aug. contra ep. Fundam. c. 4.* *Quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur, ut in dubium venire non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis rebus, quibus in Catholicâ teneor. Ita si aliquid apertissimum in Evangelio, &c.* The plain meaning of which words of S. *Augustine*, is, *That evident Truth is to be preferred before all Church-Authority:* Now a threefold Exception you take to his Lordships insisting on this Testimony. 1. *That S.* Austin *speaks not either of plain Scripture, or evident sense, or of a full demonstrative Argument; but addressing his speech to the* P. 30. Manicheans, *he writes thus*, Apud vos autem ubi nihil horum est quod me invitet ac teneat, sola personat veritatis pollicitatio (*and then follow the words cited by the Bishop*) quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur; *where it is plain* quæ, *which, is relative only to Truth, and not to Scripture, or any thing else.* A wonderful abuse of S. *Austin* to make him parallel *plain Scripture, evident sense*, or a *full Demonstrative Argument* with *Truth!* As though if *evident Truth* were more prevalent with him than all those Arguments which held him in the *Chatholick Church*, *plain Scripture, evident Sense*, or *Demonstrations* would not be so too. What Truth can be evident, if it be not one of these three? Do you think, there is any other way of manifesting *Truth*, but by *Scripture, Sense* or *Demonstration*? if you have found out other ways, oblige the world by communicating them; but till then, give us leave to think, that it is all one to say, *Manifest Truth*, as plain Scripture, evident Sense, or clear Demonstrations. But, say you,

He ſpeaks only of that Truth which the Manichees *bragged of, and promiſed:* As though S. *Auſtin* would have been perſwaded ſooner as it came from them, than as it was *Truth* in it ſelf. I ſuppoſe, S. *Auſtin* did not think their Teſtimony ſufficient, and therefore ſayes, *Quæ quidem ſi tam manifeſta monſtratur, &c. i. e.* If they could make that which they ſaid, evident to be Truth, he would quit the *Church*, and adhere to them: and if this holds againſt the *Manichees*, will it not on the ſame reaſon hold every where elſe, *viz.* That manifeſt Truth is not to be quitted on any Authority whatſoever? which is all his *Lordſhip* aſſerts.

But, *You offer to prove that S.* Auſtin, *by* Truth, *could not mean* plain Scripture; But can you prove, that by *Truth*, he did not mean *Truth*, wherever he found it, whether in Scripture, or elſewhere? *No*, ſay you, *It cannot be meant, that by Truth, he ſhould mean plain Scripture, in oppoſition to the Definitions of the Catholick Church, or General Councils*; For which you give this Reaſon, *becauſe he ſuppoſes it impoſſible, that the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, ſhould be contrary to Scripture; for then men, according to S.* Auſtin, *ſhould not believe infallibly, either the one or the other. Not the Scriptures, becauſe they are received only upon the Authority of the Church; nor the Church, whoſe Authority is infringed by the plain Scripture which is brought againſt her.* For which you produce a large citation out of S. *Auſtin* to that purpoſe. But the Anſwer to that is eaſie. For, S. *Auſtin*, when he ſpeaks of *Church-Authority, quâ infirmatâ jam nec Evangelio credere potero*; he doth not in the leaſt underſtand it of any *Definitions* of the *Church*; but of the *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Catholick Church* concerning the *Scriptures* from the time of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*. And what plain *Scriptures* thoſe are ſuppoſeable, which ſhould contradict ſuch a *Tradition* as this is, is not eaſie to underſtand. But the caſe is quite otherwiſe as to the *Churches Definitions*; for neither doth the Authority of *Scripture* at all reſt upon them; and there may be very well ſuppoſed ſome plain *Scriptures* contrary to the *Churches Definitions*, unleſs it be proved, that the *Church* is abſolutely infallible, and the very proof of that depending on *Scripture*, there muſt be an appeal made to plain *Scripture*, whether the Churches Definitions may not be contradicted by *Scripture*. When therefore you ſay, *This is an impoſſible Suppoſition, that Scripture ſhould contradict the Churches Definitions, like that of the Apoſtle; If an Angel from Heaven teach otherwiſe, let him be accurſed*, Gal. 1. You muſt prove it as impoſſible for the Church to deviate from *Scripture* in any of her Definitions, *as for an Angel to preach another Goſpel*; which will be the braver attempt, becauſe it ſeems ſo little befriended either by ſenſe or reaſon. But, ſay you, *If the Church may be an erring Definer, I would gladly know, why an erring Diſputer may not oppugn her.* That which you would ſo gladly know, is not very difficult to be reſolved, by any one who underſtands the great difference between yielding an *Internal Aſſent* to the *Definitions* of the *Church*, and *open oppoſing* them; for it only follows from the poſſibility of the *Churches* Errour in defining, that therefore we ought not to yield an *abſolute Internal Aſſent* to all her determinations, but muſt examine them by the beſt meaſures of Truth, in order to our full Aſſent to them: but, though the *Church may err*, it doth not therefore follow, that it is lawful in all caſes, or for all perſons, to oppugn her Definitions, eſpecially if thoſe Definitions be only in order to the *Churches Peace*: but if they be ſuch as require Internal Aſſent to them, then plain Scripture, evidence of Senſe, or clear Reaſon, may be ſufficient cauſe to hinder the ſubmitting to thoſe Definitions.

Cap. Fund. c. 5.

Ibidem. 2. You tell us, *That his Lordſhip hath abuſed S.* Auſtin's *Teſtimony, becauſe he ſpeaks not of the Definitions of the Church, in matters not Fundamental, according to the matter they contain; but the Truth mentioned by him*

him was Fundamental in its matter. This is the ſubſtance of your ſecond Anſwer, which is very rational and prudent, being built on this ſubſtantial Evidence. If S. *Auſtin* doth prefer manifeſt Truth before things ſuppoſed *Fundamental in the matter*, then no doubt S. *Auſtin* would not prefer manifeſt Truth, before things ſuppoſed not Fundamental in the matter. And do not you think this enough to charge his Lordſhip with ſhamefully abuſing S. *Auſtin*? But certainly, if S. *Auſtin* preferred manifeſt Truth before that which was greater, would he not do it before that which was incomparably leſs? If he did it before all thoſe things which kept him in the *Catholick Church*, ſuch as the conſent of Nations, Miracles, Univerſal Tradition, which he mentions before; do you think he would have ſcrupled to have done it, as to any particular *Definitions* of the *Church*? Theſe are therefore very excellent ways of vindicating the *Fathers* Teſtimonies, from having any thing of ſenſe or reaſon in them.

§. 3. 3. You ſay, *He hath abuſed* S. *Auſtin, by putting in a wrangling Diſputer*: But I wonder where his Lordſhip ever ſays, that S. *Auſtin* mentions any ſuch in the Teſtimony cited. For his words are theſe. *But plain Scripture, with evident Senſe, or a full Demonſtrative Argument muſt have room, where a wrangling and erring Diſputer may not be allowed it. And there's neither of theſe* (over againſt theſe words, he refers to S. *Auſtin*'s Teſtimony, and not the foregoing) *but may convince the Definition of the Council, if it be ill founded.* When you therefore ask, *Where the wrangling Diſputer is to be found*; had it not been for the help of this Cavil, we might have been to ſeek for him. But when you have been enquiring for him, at laſt you cry out, εὕρηκα, *Oh! I ſee now:* And you are the fitteſt man to find him out that I know. You ſay, *This is done to diſtinguiſh him from ſuch a Diſputer as* p. 32. *proceeds ſolidly and demonſtratively againſt the Definitions of the Church, when they are ill founded; which S.* Auſtin *is ſo far from ſuppoſing that one may do, that he judges him a mad man, who diſputes againſt any thing* quod univerſa Eccleſia ſentit; *and that they have hearts, not only of Stone, but even of Devils, who reſiſt ſo great a manifeſtation of Truth, as is made by an Oecumenical Council, for of that he ſpeaks.* Your deſign is to prove, that S. *Auſtin* doth not admit of any plea from *Scripture*, *Senſe*, or *Reaſon*, againſt any Definitions of the *Church*, for which you firſt produce that known place in which S. *Auſtin* accounts it madneſs to oppoſe the univerſal practices of the Church, which will hold for your purpoſe, as far as rites and matters of faith have any Analogy with each other; your latter Teſtimony ſeems more to the purpoſe to all perſons who do not examine it, and to none elſe. For, although you ſeemed very careful to prevent any examination of the place by a falſe citation of *Epiſt.* 153. for 152. yet that hath not hindered my diſcovering your *fraud*, in aſſerting, that S. *Auſtin* there ſpeaks of an *Oecumenical Council.* For there is not ſo much as any thing like it in that *Epiſtle.* I acknowledge thoſe words to be found there which you produce, *Nulla excuſatio jam remanſit: nimium dura, nimium diabolica ſunt hominum corda, quæ adhuc tantæ manifeſtationi veritatis obſiſtunt.* But there needs no more to confute the moſt of your Teſtimonies out of the *Fathers*, but to mention the occaſion of their being produced, or the ſcope and deſign of the *Authors*, as is moſt evident in this place. For this *Epiſtle* is written in the name of *Silvanus*, *Valentinus*, *Aurelius*, *Innocentius*, *Maximinus*, *Optatus*, *Auguſtinus*, *Donatus*, and other *Biſhops*, for ſatisfaction of the *Donatiſts* concerning the proceedings at the *Council* of *Carthage*; For the *Donatiſt Biſhops* being therein baffled, had diſperſed among their *Proſelytes* many falſe rumours of that *Council*, and of their being circumvented by their *Catholick* Adverſaries. To diſprove which in this Epiſtle, they firſt ſhew the fraud and falſity of the *Donatiſts*, and then the *Integrity* of their own proceedings

ceedings, by the choice of ſeven perſons on either ſide, who ſhould ſpeak in behalf of the reſt; and ſeven others as Counſellors to them; and four Notaries on either ſide, and four other perſons who ſhould keep the *Records* to prevent all fraud. Beſides all this, every one was to ſubſcribe in his own words, that no man might complain that any thing was corrupted afterwards; which things being diſperſed, while the perſons themſelves lived, there was no probability Poſterity ſhould be deceived in the report of them. And then follow thoſe words; *That no excuſe hath now been left, but that their hearts are too hard and diabolical, who could gainſay ſo clear a manifeſtation of Truth.* Is it not now a rare conſequence from hence to infer, That it is not lawful upon any ground of *Scripture*, *Senſe* or *Reaſon*, to diſpute the *Definitions* of *General Councils*? Whereas no ſuch thing was ever mentioned as a *General Council*, as appears by the very next words, where he ſays expreſly, it was only a *Council of* African *Biſhops*; and elſewhere S. *Auſtin* tells the *Donatiſts*, that they never durſt appeal to a *General Council.* And ſuppoſing the *Council* never ſo *Oecumenical*, he mentions nothing of the *Definitions* of it, but the manner of its proceedings. So that the greateſt Truth hereby manifeſted, is, your deſign to abuſe his Lordſhip and the Reader together.

Ecce putemus illos Epiſcopos qui Romæ judicarunt, non bonos judices fuiſſe, reſtabat adhuc plenarium Eccleſiæ univerſæ Concilium, ubi etiam cum ipſis judicibus cauſa poſſet agitari, ut ſi male judicaſſe convicti eſſent, eorum ſententiæ ſolverentur. Quod utrum fecerint, probent. Nos enim non factum eſſe facile probamus, ex eo quod totus orbis non iis communicat. Aug. Epiſt. 162.

§. 4. Since you diſown the diſtinction of *things being Fundamental in the matter and in the manner*, I ſhall not trouble you with ſhewing you the weakneſs of it: but it were eaſie to manifeſt it as good as that you embrace of the *material and formal Object*, which hath been ſufficiently refuted in the precedent chapter, and I have no leiſure for repetitions.

P. 35. n. 13. His Lordſhip endeavouring further to ſhew, *What little Foundation your Doctrine of Fundamentals hath in the forecited place of S.* Auguſtine; *urgeth this as an Argument againſt it, That if all Points defined by the Church, are therefore Fundamental, becauſe that is not to be ſhaken, which is ſettled by full Authority of the Church; then it muſt follow, That the Point there ſpoken of, the remiſſion of Original Sin, in the Baptiſm of Infants, was defined when S.* Auguſtine *wrote this, by a full ſentence of a General Council.* You deny *the Conſequence*;

P. 32. n. 2. for, ſay you, *By Authority of the Church you mean (and not unproperly) the Church generally practiſing this Doctrine, and defining it in a National Council confirmed by the Pope. For this was* plena authoritas Eccleſiæ, *though not* pleniſſima; *and to diſpute againſt what was ſo practiſed and defined, is, in S.* Auguſtine's *ſenſe, to ſhake the Foundation of the Church, if not wholly to deſtroy it.* It ſeems a little hard to underſtand what you mean by *the Churches being (not unproperly) ſaid to practiſe this Doctrine*: What, did the *Church* practiſe the *Doctrine* of the *remiſſion of Original Sin in Infants?* That a *Church* ſhould practiſe a matter of *Faith*, ſeems a little wonderful; but that it ſhould do this and that *not unproperly*, increaſeth the admiration. And we might think it a peculiar priviledge belonging to your *Church*, but that ſhe is not ſo much uſed to *practiſe* things more capable of it. And can you think it enough to run us down, by telling us, *That the Pope, with a National Council, hath defined it*, unleſs you firſt prove, that the *Pope*, *and a National Council*, have as much authority as a *General Council*, which you pretend to be infallible; and if a *National Council with the Pope* be ſo too, I wonder to what end *General Councils* are ever call'd, ſince the Infallibility may be had at a much cheaper rate.

And by the ſame reaſon you make *National Councils Infallible*, you may do *Provincial*, if the *Pope* concurrs with them; and, by the ſame reaſon the

the *Colledge* of *Cardinals* may be Infallible without any of them, becauſe of the *Pope*'s concurrence with them. And ſo, all this buſineſs of *Councils*, is but a formal piece of *Pageantry*, ſince all the *Infallibility* they have by this pretence, is conferred by the *Pope* in his concurrence; whoſe Infallibility doth not depend on the preſence of a *Council*; and therefore he muſt be as Infallible without a *Council*, as with it. So that at laſt this Diſcourſe comes to this iſſue, *He that ſhakes the Pope's Infallibility, ſhakes the Foundation of the Church*: and prove but this to have been S. *Auguſtine*'s meaning, you will highly advance the intereſt of your cauſe.

§. 5. But, whatever S. *Auſtin*'s meaning be, you think your ſelf engaged to vindicate *Bellarmine*, *who*, his Lordſhip had ſaid, *was deceived, in ſaying, That the* Pelagian *Hereſie was never condemned in an Oecumenical Council, but only in Nationals. For*, ſaith he, *While the* Pelagians *ſtood out impudently againſt National Councils, ſome of them defended* Neſtorius, *which gave occaſion to the firſt* Epheſine *Council, to excommunicate and depoſe them.* To which you anſwer, 1. *It is not credible, that* Bellarmine, *who writ ſo much of Controverſie, ſhould not have read that Council; nor can there be any ſuſpicion of his concealing the matter, had he found it there*, &c. *and therefore you ſuſpend your Aſſent till the Council's words be produced.* 2. You tell us, *That it is not enough to prove that* Pelagianiſm *was condemned by a General Council, becauſe ſome who were* Pelagians *were*; *but*, ſay you, *They were condemned not for* Pelagianiſm, *but* Neſtorianiſm, *and therefore his Lordſhip ſhoots wide of the mark.* Your Argument from *Bellarmine* will have no great force with them, who ſee no reaſon to admire his fidelity; and they who enquire into the matter of fact, in the preſent debate, will have cauſe to ſuſpect it. The ſhort account whereof is this. After that *Julianus*, *Florus*, *Orontius*, *Fabius* and others, had been depoſed and baniſhed in the *Weſtern Churches*, for the *Pelagian Hereſie*, they fly to *Conſtantinople*, and ſhroud themſelves under the protection of *Neſtorius* the *Patriarch* there, who ſecretly favoured them, and writ ſeveral Letters to *Pope Celeſtine* in behalf of them: who is ſuppoſed to have received his Doctrine of the perſon of *Chriſt* from the *Pelagians*. But when he ſaw that no good was to be done by theſe Letters, but by the daily ſpreading of *Neſtorianiſm*, the *Emperour* was forced to ſummon a *Council* at *Epheſus*, *A. D.* 431. The *Pelagians* accompany *Neſtorius* thither, and joyn with *Johannes Antiochenus*, and his party, in oppoſition to the *Synod*. But the *Council* underſtanding the proceedings which had been in the *Weſtern Churches* againſt the *Pelagians*, ratifies and confirms their depoſition, as appears by the Synodal Epiſtle of the *Council* to *Pope Celeſtine*, which is extant in the *Acts* of the *Epheſine Council*: and in the Epiſtles of *Cyril* of *Alexandria*. And beſides this, ſome of the *Canons* of that *Council*, do equally concern *Celeſtius* and *Neſtorius*; the firſt *Canon* decreeing as well the favourers of *Celeſtius* as *Neſtorius* to be excommunicate; and the fourth decreeing the *Depoſition* of all ſuch who ſhould embrace either of them. And therefore it is truly ſaid by *Janſenius*, that the *Pelagian Hereſie, and the Biſhops who favoured it, were again condemned by an Oecumenical Council.* And thence *Proſper* in the *Epitaph* of the *Neſtorian* and *Pelagian Hereſies*, as he makes the *Neſtorian* only an *Off-ſpring* of the *Pelagian*; ſo he makes both of them to fall, and be condemned together. From whence it appears, that the *Pelagians* were not condemned in the *Epheſine Council* meerly for *Neſtorianiſm*, but for their proper and peculiar ſentiments; the former depoſition of them being ratified by the *Council*, and a new *Canon* made to

P. 35. n. 13.

P. 33. n. 3.

Paulò poſt enim, lectis Commentariis Romæ ſub Cœleſtino conſcriptis, & hæreſis ipſa Pelagiana, & auctores, fautoreſq; ejus epiſcopi, ab Oecumenica Synodo iterum condemnati ſunt. Janſenius de hæreſ. Pelag. lib. 1. p. 31.

Neſtoriana lues ſucceſſit Pelagianæ,
Quæ tamen eſt utero progenerata meo.
Me tamen una dedit victam ſententia letho:
Illa volens iterum ſurgere, bis cecidit.
Mecum oritur, mecum moritur, mecumq; ſepulchrum
Intrat, & inferni carceris ima ſubit.

Proſper in Epitaph. Neſtor. & Pelag. hæreſ.

that

that purpoſe for the future. And now let the Reader judge whether his Lordſhip or *Bellarmine* were herein the more miſtaken.

§. 6. P. 36. His Lordſhip adds; *If this Hereſie were condemned only by a National Council, then the full Authority of the Church here, is no more than the full Authority of this Church of* Africk. *And I hope,* ſaith he, *That Authority doth not make all Points defined by it, to be Fundamental. You will ſay, Yes: if that Council be confirmed by the Pope. And then I muſt ever wonder, why S.* Auguſtine *ſhould ſay, The full Authority of the Church; and not beſtow one word upon the Pope, by whoſe Authority only that Council, as all other, have their fulneſs of Authority in your judgement. An inexpiable Omiſſion; if this* P. 33. n. 4. *Doctrine concerning the Pope were true.* To this you anſwer, *That there was no need of any ſpecial mention of the Pope, in ſpeaking of the Authority of the Church; becauſe his Authority is always chiefly ſuppoſed, as being Head of the whole Church.* But by whom was this ſuppoſed? *by you,* or by S. *Auguſtine?* Can you prove that S. *Auſtin,* or any of the *African Fathers* did ever ſuppoſe any ſuch thing, that the *Pope* being Head of the Church, his Authority is chiefly ſuppoſed in the *Acts* of *National Councils*? Where was the ſuppoſal of this Authority in the Diſpute between the *African Fathers,* and the *Popes,* in the caſe of *Appeals*? Theſe are ſuppoſitions, only to be obtruded upon ignorant *Novices*; and ſuch, who look no further into *Antiquity,* than the Implicit Faith in their *Prieſts* will give them leave. But what a ſtranger to all true *Antiquity* this ſuppoſition of the *Pope's being Head of the Church,* is, we ſhall ſee abundantly, when we come to the Controverſie of the Pope's Authority. Yet granting the Suppoſition true (than which nothing can be more falſe) when the main ſtrength lyes not in the bare Definition of a *National Council,* which you grant of it ſelf hath not full *Authority,* but in the confirmation of that Deciſion by the *Pope* which makes that *Authority full,* which was not ſo before; Was it not neceſſary to declare, that the *Pope* did concurr to the giving it *full Authority,* which without it could not be had? You do not ſay, That *all National Councils* have this *full Authority,* not being confirmed by the *Pope*; if therefore S. *Auguſtine* deſigned to ſhew that *Council* to have *full Authority,* the only way to prove it, was to produce the *Pope's Confirmation* of it: which cannot therefore be otherwiſe looked on, than as an *inexpiable Omiſſion,* if your Doctrine be true; for he left out that which was only pertinent and material to the buſineſs. Your parallel between S. *Auſtin* and *your ſelf* (which is a very worthy one) *in leaving out the mention of the Pope's Authority when it is underſtood,* will then hold when you produce as great evidence that S. *Auſtin* was a *Jeſuit,* as we have from your principles that you are. When you give as manifeſt proof, that the *Pope's Power* is neceſſary to all *Definitions* of *Councils,* as there is in our *Laws* for our *Kings* aſſenting to *Acts* of *Parliament*; we may give you leave to *parallel the Omiſſion of the expreſs mention of one with the other.* If the Definitions of Ancient *Councils* did run in the name of *Pope* and *Council,* as our *Acts* of *Parliament,* in the name of the *King,* and *both Houſes,* we might eaſily ſay, the Authority of them came from the *Pope,* as of theſe from the *King*; but there is nothing of that nature, but much of the contrary, as will appear in due time. When you therefore prove that the *Pope*'s Power is implied, though it be not mentioned, you muſt prove it by ſome evident Confeſſion, that no Authority of a *Council* was *full,* unleſs the *Pope* concurred with it: elſe you may as well ſay, That the great *Mogul* hath no no full Authority to decree any thing without the *Pope*'s conſent; for I dare ſay, There is no denial of it in any of his *Laws.* And yet, that is more than can be ſaid here, for we have ſufficient teſtimony from the records of that age, That the *Pope's Authority* was not ſuppoſed neceſſary to Councils, from his being *Head of the Church.* What follows p. 34. n. 5, 6. depends wholly

wholly upon the often-mentioned distinction of the *Formal and Material Object* of Faith; the foundation of which, having been already removed, whatever you offer to build upon it, must of necessity fall to the ground; but I shall not follow your ill example, *in making tedious Repetitions*, and then cry out, *You are forced to it.*

§. 7. His Lordship urgeth further, *from the Romanists Doctrine of Fundamentals, That the Churches Definition must be the Churches Foundation.* His words are, *Besides, whatsoever is Fundamental in the Faith, is Fundamental to the Church, which is one by the Unity of Faith: Therefore, if every thing defined by the Church be Fundamental in the Faith, then the Churches Definition, is the Churches Foundation. And so, upon the matter, the Church can lay her own Foundation, and then the Church must be in absolute and perfect Being, before so much as her Foundation is laid.* To which you answer; *But what Absurdity is it to grant, That the Definition of the Church teaching, is the Foundation of the Church taught? or, the Definition of the Church representative, is the Foundation of the Church diffusive?* I pray, inform us whether this *Church teaching and representing*, be the same *Church* with the *Church taught and diffusive*, or one different from it: If it be *different*, it must have a different *Foundation*, and so must be *fundamentally different*; if it be the same, then the *Church must still lay its own Foundation*: for whatever becomes *Fundamental* by the Definition of the *Church*, is, I suppose, to be believed as necessary, *i.e. Fundmental*, by the *Church teaching and representing*, as well as *taught and diffusive*. Unless you think those who decree things, to be believed by all in order to salvation, do exclude themselves out of that number; and therefore, though it be necessary for all others to believe it, it is still *indifferent* for them, whether they will believe it or no. And therefore, were I of your *Church*, I should heartily wish my self of the *teaching and representative Church*; for then others might go to *Hell* for not believing that, which I might chuse whether I would or no. What an excellent invention this is, to make the *Pope* and *Cardinals* go to *Heaven*, though they be *Atheists* and *Infidels?* For, you tell us, we can have no assurance of any matter of Faith, but from the *Infallibility* of your *Church*; this Infallibility lyes not in the *taught and diffusive*, but in the *teaching and representative Church*; and this distinction here supposes, that what is made the *Foundation* of the *Church taught*, is not the Foundation of the *Church teaching*, *i.e.* what is necessary to Salvation for one, is not so for the other; for that is your meaning of *Fundametals*. Now, since all things become necessary to be believed by the *Church diffusive*, upon the Authority of the *Church representative*, it necessarily follows, from this distinction, That nothing at all is necessary to be believed by the *Church representative*. And is not this a rare Church the mean while? but what is it which makes it a *Church?* for though it *represents* and *teaches*, yet it is still call'd a *Church teaching and representative*: If it be a *Church*, something must make it so: What can make it so, if not the belief of what is *necessary to Salvation?* And if it doth not believe all that is necessary to Salvation, the *Church diffusive* is much more truly a *Church*, than the *representative*: If it doth believe all that is necessary, then it must believe its own *Definitions*, because those are supposed to be so; and consequently, if those be *Fundamental*, *the Church must still lay her own Foundation.* Or else these consequences follow. 1. That may be a true *Church*, which doth not believe all things necessary to Salvation. 2. The *Church teaching* is not bound to believe that which she *teaches*, but only the *Church taught*. 3. That may be the same *Church* which *Fundamentally* differs from it self. 4. When the *Church* defines a thing to be *necessary*, she doth not *believe* it to be *necessary*, but it becomes necessary after her Definition. For, I pray, satisfie us as to

P. 36. n. 14.

P. 35.

this *Teaching Church*, when ſhe defines ſomething neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation, which was not ſo defined before; Doth ſhe at that *Inſtant* of her *Definition* believe that to be neceſſary to Salvation, or doth ſhe not? If ſhe doth, then it is neceſſary before her Definition; and ſo the belief of it as neceſſary, cannot depend upon it: But if ſhe believes it only to be neceſſary, becauſe ſhe defines it to be ſo; then ſhe cannot believe it to be neceſſary, till ſhe hath defined it, and conſequently defines that to be neceſſary, which ſhe believes not to be neceſſary: and ſo defines contrary to her own judgement and belief. Let me therefore ask here ſome more Queſtions, which I doubt you will think troubleſome, If the *Church repreſentative* believed that *not to be neceſſary* to Salvation, which ſhe defined *to be neceſſary to Salvation*, was ſhe infallible in that belief or no? If ſhe was not infallible, then at that time what aſſurance could men have of any matter of Faith, ſince you tell us, That muſt be had from the *Churches Infallibility*? If ſhe were infallible, then either in *ſome things only*, or in *all* ſhe believed? if only in *ſome things* we ought to know what ſhe is infallible in, and what not, leſt we deceive our ſelves in believing her infallible in that in which ſhe is not infallible? If *in all things*, then ſhe is infallible in believing that *not to be neceſſary* to Salvation, which yet ſhe infallibly defines to *be neceſſary* to Salvation: And ſo the *Church* may infallibly define that to be *true*, which at the very moment of that *Definition*, ſhe infallibly believes to be falſe. All theſe are the juſt and excellent Conſequences of this uſeful Diſtinction of *yours*, which you look on as the only happy Expedient, whereby to free your ſelf from aſſerting, that the *Church*, by making things *Fundamental*, by her *Definitions*, *doth thereby lay her own Foundation*.

§. 8. But as abſurd and unreaſonable as this is, you would ſeem to have ſomething to ſay for it: for you tell us, *That the Paſtors, in all Ages preſerving Chriſtian People from being carried away with every wind of Doctrine, are a Foundation to them of conſtancy in Doctrine*. Wonderfully ſubtle! it is pity ſuch excellent reaſoning ſhould want the ornaments of *Mood* and *Figure*: but thus it is in them. If the Paſtors of the Church may be the means of preſerving men from errours, then the Definition of the *Church teaching*, is the Foundation of the *Church taught*: which in ſhort amounts to this; If the *Paſtors* of the *Church* may be a Foundation of mens *conſtancy in Doctrine*, then they may be a Foundation of mens *inconſtancy in Doctrine*. If this be not that you mean, I can make no ſenſe of what you ſay; and if it be, let any one elſe make *Senſe* of it, that hath a gift for it. For, by *conſtancy in Doctrine*, is meant, the adhering to that *Doctrine* which *God hath revealed* as neceſſary in his Word, but by the Definitions of the *teaching Church*, you underſtand a Power to make more things neceſſary to the Salvation of all than *Chriſt* hath made; ſo that, joyn theſe two together, the Conſequence is this: If the *Paſtors* of the *Church* may, and ought to keep men from believing any other *Doctrine*, then they have power to impoſe *another Doctrine*; which things are ſo contradictious to each other, that none but one of your *faculty* would have ventured to have ſet one to prove the other. Therefore when you would prove any thing by this Argument, your *Medium* muſt be this, That the *Paſtors* of the *Church* are a *Foundation of conſtancy in Doctrine*, by laying *New Foundations of Doctrines* by her Definitions, which is juſt as if you would prove, That the beſt way to keep a Houſe entire, without any additions, is to build another houſe adjoynning to it.

Ibid.

But, ſay you further, *Were not the Apoſtles in their times* (*who were* Eccleſia docens) *by their Doctrine and Decrees, a Foundation to the Church which was taught by them? Doth not S.* Paul *expreſly affirm it*, ſuperædificati ſupra Fundamentum Apoſtolorum, &c. To which I anſwer. 1. That the *Apoſtles* were

were not therefore ſaid to be the *Foundation* on which they were built who believed on that Doctrine, becauſe, by virtue of their *Power*, they could define or decree any thing to be neceſſary to Salvation, which was not ſo before; but, becauſe they were the *Inſtruments* whereby the things which were neceſſary to Salvation, were conveyed to them. And becauſe their Authority, by virtue of their *Miſſion*, and the *Power* accompanying it, was the means whereby they were brought to believe the Doctrine of the *Goſpel*, as in it ſelf true. But there is a great deal of difference between *teaching* what is neceſſary to Salvation, and making any thing neceſſary to Salvation, which was not before, meerly becauſe it is taught by them. 2. I grant, that thoſe things did become neceſſary to be believed, which the *Apoſtles* taught; but it was either becauſe the things were in themſelves neceſſary, in order to the end declared, *viz. Man's Salvation*, or elſe it was on the account of that evidence which the *Apoſtles* gave, that they were perſons immediately imployed by *God*, to deliver thoſe Doctrines to them. But ſtill here is nothing becoming neceſſary, by virtue of a Decree or Definition, but by virtue of a *Teſtimony*, that what they delivered, came from *God*. 3. When the *Apoſtles* delivered theſe things, the *Doctrine* of the *Goſpel* was not made known to the world; but they were choſen by *God*, and infallibly aſſiſted for that end, that they might reveal it to the world: And this is certainly a very different caſe from that, when the Doctrine of Salvation is fully revealed and delivered down to us in unqueſtionable records. And therefore, if you will prove any thing to your purpoſe, you muſt prove as great and as divine aſſiſtance of the Spirit in the *Church repreſentative* of all Ages, as was in the *Apoſtles* in the firſt Age of the Chriſtian Church. 4. When you ſay from hence, That the *Apoſtles*, as the *teaching Church*, laid the *Foundation of the Church taught*; that can only be underſtood of thoſe *Chriſtians* who became a *Church*, by the *Apoſtles* preaching the *Doctrine* of the *Goſpel* to them: but this is quite a different thing from laying the *Foundation* of a *Church* already in being as your *Church*, taught, and diffuſive, is ſuppoſed to be. Can you tell us, where the Apoſtles are ſaid to lay further Foundations for *Churches* already conſtituted; that they made or declared more things neceſſary to Salvation, than were ſo antecedently to their being a *Church*? But this is your caſe, you pretend a power in your *Church repreſentative*, to make more things neceſſary to Salvation, than were before to a *Church* already in *Being*, and therefore ſuppoſed to believe all things neceſſary to Salvation. You ſee therefore, what a vaſt diſparity there is in the caſe, and how far the *Apoſtles* declaring the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, and thereby founding *Churches*, is from being an Argument that the *repreſentative Church*, may lay the Foundation of the *Church diffuſive*, which being a *Church* already, muſt have its *Foundation* laid before all new Decrees and Definitions of the *teaching Church*. So that ſtill it unavoidably follows upon your principles, That the *Church muſt lay her own Foundation*, and then the *Church* muſt have been in abſolute and perfect *Being*, before ſo much as her *Foundation* is laid. Your weak endeavour of retorting this upon the *Biſhop*, becauſe of the *Apoſtles teaching the Church* of their Age, only ſhews, that you have a good will to ſay ſomething in behalf of ſo bad a caſe, but that you want ability to do it: as appears by the Anſwers already given, as to the difference of the *Apoſtles* caſe and yours. The ſubſequent *Section*, which is ſpent in a weak defence of *A. C.*'s *words*, hath the leſs cauſe to be particularly examined; and beſides, its whole ſtrength lies on things ſufficiently diſcuſſed already, *viz.* the ſufficient Propoſition of matters of Faith, and the Material and Formal Object of it. p. 39.

That which follows pretending to ſomething *New*, and which looks like Argumentation, muſt be more diſtinctly conſidered. *A. C.*'s words are, §. 9.

That if one may deny, or doubtfully diſpute againſt any one Determination of the Church, then he may againſt another, and another, and ſo againſt all: ſince all are made firm to us by one and the ſame Divine Revelation, ſufficiently applied by one and the ſame full Authority of the Church; which being weakned in any one, cannot be firm in any other. To which his Lordſhip anſwers, 1. *That this is underſtood only of Catholick Maxims, which are properly Fundamental, by* Vincentius Lirinenſis, *from whom this Argument is derived.* 2. *He denies, that all Determinations of the Church are made firm to us by one and the ſame Divine Revelation.* 3. *He denies, that all Determinations of the Church are ſufficiently applied by one and the ſame full Authority of the Church.* Of each of theſe he gives his reaſons; the examination and defence of which, is all that remains of this Chapter. To the firſt, you anſwer three things (for I muſt digeſt your Anſwers for you.) 1. *That there is no evidence, that* A. C. *borrowed this from* Vincentius, and you give an excellent reaſon for it, *becauſe good wits may both hit on the ſame thing,* or at leaſt come near it; which, had it been ſaid of your ſelf, had been more unqueſtionable: but, to let that paſs, 2. You tell us, *That the Doctrine is true, whoſoever ſaid it.* For which, you give this reaſon. *For the ſame reaſon which permits not our queſtioning, or denying the prime Maxims of Faith, permits not our queſtioning, or denying any other Doctrine declared by the Church; becauſe it is not the greatneſs or ſmalneſs of the matter, that moves us to give firm Aſſent in Points of Faith; but the Authority of God ſpeaking by the Church.* To which I anſwer, that all this runs upon a Suppoſition falſe in it ſelf, which is, *That all our Aſſurance in matters of Faith, depends upon the Infallible Authority of the preſent Church*; which being granted, I would not deny but ſuppoſing that *Infallibility* abſolute, on the ſame reaſon I believe one thing on the *Churches Authority*, I muſt believe all. For the caſe were the ſame then, as to the *Church*, which we ſay, it is as to the *Scriptures*; he that believes any thing, on the account of its being contained in that *Book* as the *Word of God*, muſt believe every thing he is convinced to be therein contained, whether the matter be in it ſelf ſmall or great; becauſe the ground of his belief, is the *Authority of God*, revealing thoſe things to us. And if therefore you could prove ſuch a *Divine Authority*, conſtantly reſident in the *Church*, for determining all matters of Faith, I grant your conſequence would hold: but that is too great a *boon* to be had for *begging*, and that is all the way you uſe for it here. If you offer to prove it afterwards, our Anſwers ſhall be ready to attend you. But at preſent, let it ſuffice to tell you, That we believe no Article of Faith at all upon the *Churches Infallible Authority*; and therefore, though we deny what the *Church* propoſeth, it follows not that we are any more liable to queſtion the truth of any Article any further than the *Churches Authority* reaches in it; *i.e.* we deny that any thing becomes an Article meerly upon her *account*. But now, if you remove the Argument from the *preſent Churches Infallible Authority*, to the *Univerſal Churches Teſtimony*, we then tell you, That he who queſtions a clear, full, univerſal Tradition of the whole *Church* from *Chriſt's time* to this, will, by the ſame reaſon, doubt of all matters of *Faith*, which are conveyed by this *Teſtimony* to us. But then we muſt further conſider, That we are bound by virtue of the *Churches Teſtimony*, to believe nothing any further, than it appears to have been the conſtant, full, *Univerſal Teſtimony* of the *Church*, from the time of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*. Whatever therefore you can make appear to have been received as a neceſſary Article of Faith in this manner, we embrace it, but nothing elſe; and on the other ſide, we ſay, That whoever doubts, or denies this Teſtimony, will doubt of all matters of Faith, becauſe the ground and rule of *Faith*, the *Scriptures*, is conveyed to us only through this Univerſal Tradition.

p. 38. n. 15.

n. 16.

p. 37.

3. You

3. You answer, *That his Lordship mistakes Vincentius Lirinensis his meaning, and falsifies his testimony thrice at least.* Whereof the *first* is in *rendring* [*de Catholico dogmate*] *of Catholick Maximes* : and here a double most dreadful charge is drawn up against his Lordship ; the first from the accusation of *Priscian*, and the second of no less Authors, than *Rider* and the *English Lexicons* : the first is, for translating the *Singular Number by the Plural* ; whereas our most Reverend *Orbilius* himself in the following *page*, tells us, that this *Catholicum dogma*, *Vincentius* speaks of, *contains the whole of Systeme the Catholick Faith, and in that Systeme some are Fundamentals, some Superstructures*, (both Plurals) yet all these contained in this one *singular Dogma* : but it was his Lordships great mishap not to have his education in the *Schools* of the *Jesuites*, else he might have escaped the *lash* for this most unpardonable oversight of rendring *verbum multitudinis* by our Authors own confession (who makes it larger too than his Lordship doth; for his Lordship saith, it contains only *Fundamentals*, but our Author *Superstructures* too) by the *Plural Number*. But the second fault is worse than this ; for, saith our Author very gravely and discreetly with his rod in his hand, *But in what Author learnt he, that Dogma signifies only Maximes, were it in the Plural number ? Dogma according to our English Lexicons, Rider, and others, signifies a Decree, or common received Opinion, whether in prime, or less principal matters.* What a learned dispute are we now fallen into? But I see you were resolved to put all but *Boys* and *Pædagogues* out of all likelyhood of confuting you ; For those are only the persons among us, who deal in *Rider* and *English Lexicons*. I see now, there is some hopes, that the orders of the *Inquisition* may have better *Latin*, than that against Mr. *White* had ; since our old *Jesuites* begin to be so well versed in such Masters of the *Latin* tongue. How low is *Infallibility* fallen, that we must appeal for knowing what *Dogma fidei* is, to the definition not of *Popes and Councils*, but of *Rider* and *English Lexicons* ? But it is ill jesting with our *Orbilius* in so severe a humour, that his *Grace of Canterbury* cannot scape his *lash* for not consulting *Riders Dictionary* for the signification of *Dogma*. But our Author passeth, and we must attend him, out of his *Grammatical into the Theological School* ; and there tells us, *That the Ecclesiastical signification of Dogma, extends it self to all things established in the Church, as matters of Faith, whether Fundamentals or Superstructures* ; *and for this, Scotus is cited* (somewhat a better Author than *Rider*) *who calls Transubstantiation, Dogma fidei.* I begin to believe now, that *Dogma* is a very large word, and *Fides* much larger, that can hold so prodigious a thing as *Transubstantiation* within them. But, notwithstanding what *Rider* and *Scotus* say, None so able to explain *Vincentius* his meaning, as *Vincentius* himself. To him therefore at last our Author appeals and tells us, *That he declares in other places, that he means by Dogma such things as in general belong to Christian Faith without distinction.* But doth *Vincentius* any where by *Dogma* mean any such things which were not judged necessary by the ancient and Primitive *Church*, but become necessary to be believed upon the *Churches Definitions* ? Nothing can possibly be imagined more directly contrary to the design of his whole *Book* than that is, when he appeals still for matters to be believed to *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent* ; and to be sure, all these are required to whatever he means by a *Dogma fidei* : if you therefore can produce any testimonies out of his Book, which can be supposed in the least to favour the power of the *Church* in her new *Definitions* of matters of Faith, you may justly challenge to your self the name of an excellent Invention, who can find that in his Book, which all other persons find the directly contrary to. Your first citation is out of *ch.* 33. (not 23. as you quote it, or some one else for you) where he is explaining *what St. Paul means by, Prophanas*

§. 10. P. 37. n. 8.

P. 38

vocum

vocum novitates. Vocum, ſaith he, *i. e. Dogmatum, rerum, ſententiarum novitates; quæ ſunt vetuſtati, quæ antiquitati contrariæ.* I ſhall not ſcruple to grant you that *Vincentius* by *Dogmata* here, doth mean ſuch things as the *Definitions* of your *Church* are, for he ſpeaks of thoſe things, which all *Chriſtians*, who have a care of their Salvation, are to aovid; of ſuch things as are contrary to all *Antiquity*; and ſuch kind of *Dogmata*, I freely grant the *Definitions* of your *Church* to be. Your ſecond citation is as happy as the firſt, *cap.* 28. *Creſcat* (ſaith he, ſpeaking of the Church) *ſed in ſuo duntaxat genere, in eodem ſcilicet Dogmate, eodem ſenſu, eâdemque ſententiâ.* An excellent place, no doubt, to prove it in the Churches power to define new Articles of Faith; becauſe the Church muſt always remain in the ſame Belief, *ſenſe*, and *opinion*. When his words but little foregoing are, *Profectus ſit ille fidei non permutatio*, which without the help of *Engliſh Lexicons* you would willingly render by leaving out that troubleſome Particle *non*, that the *beſt progreſs in Faith is by adding new Articles*, though it be as contrary to reaſon as it is to the ſenſe of *Vincentius Lerinenſis*. If *Vincentius* ſaith, that the *Pelagians erred in Dogmate fidei* (which words neither appear *cap.* 24. nor 34.) he gives this reaſon for it, becauſe they contradict the *Univerſal ſenſe of Antiquity*, and the *Catholick Church*, *cap.* 34. So that ſtill *Vincentius*, where-ever he ſpeaks of this *Dogma fidei*, ſpeaks in direct oppoſition to your ſenſe of it, for new definitions of the Church in matters of Faith. There being ſcarce any book extant which doth more deſignedly overthrow this opinion of yours, than that of *Vincentius* doth.

§. 11. To ſhew therefore how much you have wronged his Lordſhip, and what little advantage comes to your cauſe by your inſiſting on *Vincentius* his teſtimony: I ſhall give a brief account both of his Deſign and Book. The deſign of it, is, to ſhew what ways one ſhould uſe to prevent being deceived, by ſuch who pretend to diſcover new matters of Faith, and

Commonit. 1. *c.* 1. thoſe he aſſigns to be theſe two, ſetling ones faith, *on the Authority of Scripture, and the tradition of the Catholick Church.* But ſince men would enquire, *the Canon of Scripture being perfect, and abundantly ſufficient for all things, what need can there be of Eccleſiaſtical tradition?* He anſwers, For

Cap. 2. finding out the true *ſenſe* of *Scripture*, which is diverſly interpreted, by *Novatianus, Photinus, Sabellius, Donatus, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris*, &c. In the following Chapter he tells us, what he means by this *Eccleſiaſtical tradition, Quod ubique, quod ſemper, ab omnibus creditum*

Cap. 3. *eſt*, that which hath *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent*, joyning in the belief of it. And can any new *Definitions* of the *Church* pretend to all,

Cap. 4. or any of theſe? He after enquires, what is to be done in caſe a particular *Church* ſeparates it ſelf from the communion of the *Catholick*? He anſwers, We ought to prefer the health of the whole body, before any peſtiferous or corrupted member. But in caſe any Novel Contagion ſhould ſpread over, not a part only, but endanger the *whole Church*? then, ſaith he, *a man muſt adhere to Antiquity*, which cannot be deceived with a pretence of Novelty. But if in *Antiquity*, we find out the errour of two or three particular Perſons, or City, or Province; what is then to be done? then, ſaith he, the *Decrees of General Councils* are to be preferred: But in caſe there be none? then he adds, The general conſent of the moſt approved writers of the *Church* is to be enquired after; and what they all with one conſent, openly, frequently, conſtantly held, writ, and taught, that let every man look on himſelf as bound to believe without heſitation. Now then, prove but any one of the new Articles of *Faith* in the *Tridentine Confeſſion* by theſe rules of *Vincentius*; and it will appear, that you have produced his Teſtimony to ſome purpoſe: elſe nothing will be more ſtrong and forcible againſt all your pretences, than this diſcourſe of *Vincentius* is;

which

which he inlarges by the examples of the *Donatists*, *Arrians*, and others, in the following Chapters; in which ſtill his ſcope is to aſſert *Antiquity*, and condemn all *Novelties in matters of Faith under any pretext whatſoever*. For this, *ch.* 12, 14. he cites a multitude of Texts of Scripture; forbidding our following any other Doctrine, but what was delivered by Chriſt and his *Apoſtles*; and *Anathematizing* all ſuch as ſhould Preach any *other Goſpel*: and concludes that, with this remarkable ſpeech; *It never was, never is, never will be, lawful to propoſe any thing* (as matter of Faith) *to Chriſtian Catholicks, beſides what they have received. And it was, is, and will be becoming Chriſtians to Anathematize all ſuch who declare any thing but what they have received.* Do you think this man was not of your mind in the Doctrine of *Fundamentals*? could he do otherwiſe than believe it in the *Churches power* to define things neceſſary to Salvation, who would have all thoſe *Anathematized*, who pretend to declare any thing as matter of Faith, but what they received as ſuch from their *Anceſtors*? And after he hath at large exemplified this in the *Photinian, Neſtorian, Apollinarian* Hereſies, and ſhewed how little the *Authority* of private *Doctors*, how excellent ſoever, is to be relyed on in matters of faith; he concludes again with this, *Whatſoever the Catholick Church held univerſally, that and that alone is to be held by particular perſons.* And after *admires at the madneſs, blindneſs, perverſeneſs of thoſe, who are not contented with the once delivered and ancient rule of Faith; but are ſtill ſeeking new things, and always are itching to add, alter, take away, ſome thing of Religion* (*or matter of Faith*), *As though that were not a Heavenly Doctrine, which may ſuffice to be once revealed; but an earthly inſtitution, which cannot be perfect, but by continual correction and amendment.* Is not this man now a fit perſon to explain the ſenſe of your *Churches* new definitions, and Declarations in matters of Faith? And have not you hit very right on this ſenſe of *Dogma*, when here he underſtands by it that *Doctrine of Faith*, which is not capable of any addition or alteration? And thus we underſtand ſufficiently what he means by the preſent controverted place; that *if men reject any part of the Catholick Doctrine, they may as well refuſe another, and another, till at laſt they reject all.* By the *Catholick Doctrine*, or *Catholicum dogma*, there he means the ſame with the *Cœleſte dogma* before, and by both of them underſtands that Doctrine of Faith which was once revealed by *God*, and which is capable of no addition at all, having *Antiquity, Univerſality, and Conſent*, going along with it; and when you can prove that this *Catholicum Dogma*, doth extend beyond thoſe things which his *Lordſhip* calls *Catholick Maxims*, or properly *Fundamental Truths*, you will have done ſomething to the purpoſe, which as yet you have failed in. And thus we ſay, *Vincentius* his rule is good, though we do not ſay, that he was *infallible* in the *application* of it, but that he might mention ſome ſuch things to have had *Antiquity, Univerſality*, and *Conſent* which had not ſo, ſuch as the buſineſs of not *rebaptizing Hereticks*, and the obſervation of *Eaſter*, which you inſtance in. And withall we add, though nothing is to be admitted for matter of *Faith* which wants thoſe three marks, yet ſome things may have all three of them.

Nihil novandum niſi quod traditum eſt. Noſq; religionem, non quæ vellemus ducere, ſed quæ illa duceret, ſequi oportere. Idque eſſe proprium Chriſtianæ modeſtiæ & gravitatis, non ſua poſteris tradere, ſed à majoribus accepta ſervare. cap. 9.

Adnunciare ergo aliquid Chriſtianis Catholicis præter id quod acceperunt, nunquam licuit, nunquam licet, nunquam licebit: & Anathematizare eos qui Adnuncient aliquid præterquam quod ſemel acceptum eſt, nunquam non oportuit, nuſquam non oportet, nuſquam non oportebit. Vincent. Lerin. cap. 14.

Quicquid univerſaliter antiquitùs Eccleſ. Catholicam tenuiſſe cognoverit, id ſolùm ſibi tenendum, credendumque decernit. cap. 25.
Mirari ſatis nequeo tantam quorundam hominum veſaniam, tantam excæcatæ mentis impietatem, tantam poſtremò errandi libidinem, ut contenti non ſint traditâ ſemel & acceptâ antiquitùs credendi regulâ; ſed nova & nova in diem quærunt, ſemperque aliquid geſtiunt religioni addere, mutare, detrahere. Quaſi non cœleſte dogma ſit, quod ſemel revelatum eſſe ſufficiat; ſed terrena inſtitutio, quæ aliter perfici niſi aſſiduâ emendatione, immò potius reprehenſione, non poſſit. cap. 26.

Abdicatâ enim qualibet parte Catholici dogmatis, alia quoq; item atq; alia, &c. quid aliud ad extremum ſequetur, niſi ut totum pariter repudietur? cap. 31.

them, and yet be *no matters* of *Faith* at all; and therefore not at all pertinent to this queſtion; Such as thoſe things are which you inſiſt on, as *depoſita dogmata*; which doubtleſs is a rare way of probation. *viz.* to ſhew that by *dogmata depoſita*, *Vincentius* means ſome *articles of Faith* which are not *Fundamental* in the matter of them; and for that make choice of ſuch inſtances which are no *matters of Faith at all*: but either ritual traditions, or matters of order, ſuch as the *form and matter of Sacraments*, the *Hierarchy of the Church*, *Pædobaptiſm*, *not rebaptizing Hereticks*, *the perpetual virginity of the Virgin* Mary. For that of the *Canon of Scripture*, it will be elſewhere conſidered, as likewiſe thoſe other *Church-traditions*.

§. 12. P. 39. How *the Church ſhould ſtill keep*, *hoc idem quod antea*, as you confeſs *ſhe ought*, and yet *make ſome things neceſſary to be believed by all*, *which before her declaration were not ſo*, is ſomewhat hard to conceive; and yet both theſe you aſſert together. Is that which is neceſſary to be believed by all, the ſame with that which was not neceſſary to be ſo believed? if the ſame meaſure of Faith will not ſerve after, which would have done before, is there not an alteration made? *Yes*, you grant, *as to our believing*, *but not as to the thing*, *for that is the ſame it was*. But do you in the mean time conſider what kind of *thing* that is which you ſpeak of, which is a thing *propounded to be believed*, and conſidered in no other reſpect, but as it is revealed *by God* in order to our believing it; now when the ſame thing which was required only to be believed implicitely, *i. e.* not at all neceſſarily, is now propounded to be believed expreſly and neceſſarily; the *Fundamental* nature of it, as an *object of Faith*, is altered. For that which you call *implicite Faith*, doth really imply as to all thoſe things to be believed implicitely, that there is an indifferency, whether they be believed or no; nothing being neceſſary to be believed, but what is propounded to be expreſly believed: Which being ſo, Can it be imagined there ſhould be a greater alteration in a matter of Faith, than from its being indifferent whether it were believed or no, to become neceſſary to be expreſly believed by all in order to Salvation? And where there is ſuch an alteration as this in the thing to be believed, who can without the help of a very commodious implicite Faith believe, that ſtill this is *hoc idem quod antea*, the very ſame as a matter of Faith, which it was before? Though *the Church were careful to preſerve every Iota and tittle of Sacred Doctrines*; yet I hope it follows not, that every *Iota* and *tittle* is of as much conſequence, and as neceſſary to be believed, as the main ſubſtance of *Chriſtian Doctrine*. Although *when any Doctrine was violently oppoſed in the Church ſhe might declare her owning it by ſome overt act*; yet thence it doth not follow, that the *internal aſſent* to every thing ſo declared is as neceſſary, as to that *propoſition*, that *Jeſus is the Son of God*, the belief of which the Scripture tells us was the main deſign of the writing of *Scripture*. That *General Councils*, *rightly proceeding*, *may be great helps to the Faith of Chriſtians*, I know none that deny; but that by vertue of their definitions any thing becomes neceſſary to be believed, which was not ſo before, remains yet to be proved.

§. 13. P. 39. You much wonder his Lordſhip ſhould father that ſaying on *Vincentius*, That, *If new Doctrines be added to the old*, *the Church*, *which is* Sacrarium veritatis, *the repoſitory of verity*, *may be changed in* Lupanar errorum, *which*, *his Lordſhip ſaith*, *he is loth to Engliſh*: for you tell us, *That* Vincentius *is ſo far from entertaining the leaſt thought of it*, *that he preſently adds*, Deus avertat, *God forbid it ſhould be ſo*. A ſtout Inference! Juſt as if one ſhould ſay, The *Church* of *Rome* may be in time overſpread with the *Mahumetan Religion*, but *God* forbid, it ſhould be ſo; Were he not an excellent Diſputer, who ſhould hence infer it *impoſſible* ever to be ſo? What you add

add out of *Vincentius* only proves, that he did not believe it was ſo in his time, but doth not in the leaſt prove, that he believed it *impoſſible* that ever it ſhould be ſo afterwards; but notwithſtanding all that you ſay, it is evident enough, that *Vincentius* believed it a very ſuppoſable Caſe, by that queſtion he puts elſewhere. *What if any new contagion doth not only endeavour to defile a part only, but the whole Church? in which,* he ſaith, *we are to adhere to antiquity.* If you anſwer, he ſpeaks only of *an endeavour*: it is ſoon relpyed, That he ſpeaks of *ſuch an endeavour* as puts men to diſpute a queſtion, what they are to do in ſuch a Caſe, and he reſolves at that time, they are not to adhere to the judgement of the *preſent Church*, but to that of *Antiquity*, which is all we deſire in that Caſe, *viz.* That the *preſent Church* may ſo far add to matters of Faith, that we can in no reaſon be obliged to rely only upon her judgement. Wherein we are to conſider, the *Queſtion* is not of that you call the *diffuſive*, but the *repreſentative Church*, all which may be overſpread, and yet but a part of the other; but yet if that *Church*, whoſe judgement you ſay only is to be relyed on may be ſo infected, it is all one as to thoſe who are to be guided by her *judgement*, whether the *other* be or no. For here *eadem eſt ratio non entis & non apparentis*, becauſe it is not the reality, but the manifeſtation which is the ground of mens relying on the *Churches* judgement. So that if as to all outward *appearance* and all *judicial acts* of the *Church*, ſhe may recede from the ancient Faith, and add *novitia veteribus*, (whether all particular perſons in it do ſo or no) all ground of relying on the judgement of that *Church*, is thereby taken away. Whether it be *the Church her ſelf, or Hereticks in the Church which make theſe additions*, is very little material, if theſe *Hereticks*, who add theſe *new articles of Faith*, may carry themſelves ſo cunningly as to get to themſelves the reputation of the *Catholick Church*: and ſo that which ought to have been *Sacrarium veritatis*, may become *impiorum & turpium errorum Lupanar*: which your Church is concerned not to have *Engliſhed*; but by the help of *Rider*, and other good *Authors* of yours, it is no hard matter to come to underſtand it. And thus we ſee how much you have abuſed his Lordſhip, in charging him with a threefold falſification of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*.

Quid ſi novella aliqua contagio non jam portiunculam tantum, ſed totam pariter Eccleſiam commaculare conetur? tunc item providebit, ut antiquitati inhæreat. cap. 4.

The ſecond thing which his Lordſhip anſwers, is, *That all determinations of the Church are not made firm to us by one and the ſame Divine Revelation; becauſe ſome are made by Scripture, and others; as* Stapleton *ſaith, without any evident or probable teſtimony of Holy writ: though therein* Bellarmine *falls quite off, and confeſſes in expreſs terms, that nothing can be certain by certainty of Faith, unleſs it be contained immediately in the Word of God: or be deduced thence by evident conſequence.* Your only deſign here, is, to vindicate your two great Champions from contradicting each other, which though it be of little conſequence to the main Aſſertion of his Lordſhip, which you knew well enough, and therefore carefully avoid the main Charge of your enemy, to part two of your quarrelling friends: yet ſince you intend this for a tryal of your *skill*, we muſt ſee how well you play your *Prize*. Stapleton, *you ſay, means that we muſt ſubmit to the determinations of the Church and the traditions ſhe approves, though they be not expreſly contained in Scripture.* Excellently well gueſſed at *Stapletons* meaning! when the very words you cite out of him are, *We ought not to deny our aſſent in matters of Faith, though we have them only by tradition, or the deciſions of the Church againſt Hereticks, and not confirmed with evident or probable teſtimony of Scripture.* What a rare Interpreter are you grown ſince your acquaintance with *Rider*, and other *Engliſh Lexicons*? Who make *not denying aſſent* in matters of Faith, to be

§. 14. p. 39. n. 16.

p. 42. n. 9.

the ſame with *ſubmitting to the Churches Determinations*, when you know well enough, we plead for ſubmiſſion to the *Churches Determinations*, where there may be a liberty as to *internal aſſent*: and it is as good to make *no evident or probable teſtimony of Scripture the ſame with not being expreſly contained in Scripture*; as though nothing which was not expreſly contained in *Scripture*, could have any probable teſtimony from thence. And from this we may gueſs what an eaſie matter it is for you to accommodate all perſons who differ, if one ſayes *Yes*, and the other *No*, you will tell them they do not differ, but that one of them by *Yes* means, *No*, and the other by *No*, means, *Yes*. Juſt ſo here you reconcile *Stapleton* and *Bellarmine*; for you ſay, *Stapleton* by [no probable teſtimony] means ſome kind of probable teſtimony, *viz.* ſuch as though not expreſs, may be yet deduced from *Scripture*; and *Bellarmine*, when he ſpeaks of *Gods written Word*, as the *ground of certainty*, means that which is neither *Gods Word*, nor yet *written*, viz. *Tradition*. I never met with one who had a better faculty of reconciling than you ſeem to have by this attempt. But his Lordſhip had prevented this ſubterfuge as to *Bellarmine* and *Stapleton*, *as if* Stapleton *ſpake of*
p. 40. *the Word of God written, and* Bellarmine *of the Word of God unwritten* (as he calls *Tradition*). For *Bellarmine*, ſaith he, *there treats of the knowledge which a man hath of the certainty of his own Salvation. And I hope* A. C. *will not tell us there's any Tradition extant unwritten, by which particular men may have aſſurance of their ſeveral Salvations. Therefore* Bellarmine's *whole Diſputation there, is quite beſide the matter: Or elſe, he muſt ſpeak*
P. 43. *of the written Word, and ſo lye croſs to* Stapleton *as is mentioned.* You tell us, This *Reaſon is very ſtrange*: But I dare ſay, yours exceeds it in ſtrangeneſs, which is, *becauſe* Bellarmines *deſign was to ſhew, there was no ſuch unwritten Tradition to be found.* But doth *Bellarmine* diſpute againſt any body or no body? If he diſputes againſt any body upon your principles, thoſe whom he diſputes againſt muſt be ſuch, who aſſert that men may have certainty of *Faith* concerning their Salvation from *Tradition*; and you would do well to tell us, who thoſe were that pretended that there was a Tradition or unwritten word delivered down from the *Apoſtles*, that they ſhould be ſaved. And though *Bellarmine* was not to affirm this, yet thoſe he diſputed againſt, upon your Principles muſt be ſuppoſed to do it. But certainly you thought none of your Readers did ever intend to look into *Bellarmine* for the place in Controverſie; for if they did, nothing could be more plain, than that *Bellarmines* reaſon againſt *Catharinus* and others, proceeds wholly and only upon the *written Word*. For, 1. When
Bellarm. de juſtific. l. 3. c. 8. ſect. 2. he ſaith, that *Nothing can be certain with the certainty of Faith, but what is either immediately contained in the Word of God, or may be deduced thence by evident conſequence, becauſe Faith can reſt on nothing, but the authority of Gods Word*; he adds, *That of this principle, neither the Catholicks nor the Hereticks doubt.* But I pray, do thoſe whom *Bellarmine* there calls *Hereticks*, acknowledge the unwritten Word as a foundation for certainty of Faith in the Caſe Diſputed? therefore it is plain, he ſpeaks excluſively of a written Word. 2. When he mentions the Aſſumption, he evidently explains himſelf of the *written Word*; for, ſaith he, *There is no ſuch Propoſition contained in the Word of God, that ſuch and ſuch a particular perſon is juſtified*; *for there are none mentioned therein ſave* Mary Magdalen, *and a certain Paralytick of whom it is ſaid, their ſins are forgiven them. Cæteri homines in ſacris literis nè nominantur quidem.* And will *Rider*, and your other good friends *the Engliſh Lexicons*, help you to interpret *Sacræ literæ* by *unwritten Traditions*? Could any one that had either any *common ſenſe* left in him, or elſe had not a deſign moſt groſly to impoſe on his Readers, offer to perſwade men,

that

that *Bellarmine* could here understand the *Word of God* in a sense common to *Scripture* and *Tradition*. If you can prove that *Bellarmine* saith otherwise elsewhere, you are so far from reconciling *Bellarmine* and *Stapleton*, that you will not easily reconcile *Bellarmine* to himself.

The remainder of this Chapter either refers to something to be handled afterwards, as the *Infallibility of the Church and Councils*, or else barely repeats what hath been discussed already concerning your sense of *Fundamentals*, and therefore I dare not presume so far on the Reader's patience, as to give him the same things *over and over*. P. 43, 44

CHAP. IV.

The Protestant Doctrine of Fundamentals vindicated.

The unreasonableness of demanding a Catalogue of Fundamentals. The Creed contains the Fundamentals of Christian Communion. The belief of Scripture supposed by it. The Dispute concerning the Sense of Christ's Descent into Hell, and Mr. Rogers *his Book confessed by* T. C. *impertinent: with others of the same nature.* T. C's. *fraud, in citing his Lordships words. Of Papists and Protestants Unity. The Moderation of the Church of* England, *compared with that of* Rome. *Her grounds of Faith justified. Infant-Baptism how far proved out of Scripture alone.*

THis Chapter begins with *a very pertinent Question*, as you call it: we might the easier believe it to be so, because it is none of your own proposing; but yet your very calling it, *a pertinent Question*, renders it liable to suspicion, and upon examination it will be found both unreasonable and impertinent. The Question was, *What Points the Bishop would account Fundamental*; and that you may shew how necessary this Question was, you add; *For if he will have some Fundamental, which we are bound to believe under pain of damnation; and others not Fundamental, which we may, without sin, question, or deny; it behoves us much to know, what they are. I have ever desired*, say you, *a satisfactory Answer from Protestants to this Question, but could never yet have it in the sense demanded.* An unhappy man you are, who, it seems, have in your time propounded more foolish Questions, than a great many wise men were ever able to answer. But, is it not every jot as reasonable, That since your *Church* pretends to the power of making things necessary to the Salvation of all, which were not so before, we should have from you an exact *Catalogue* of all *your Churches* Definitions? If for that, you refer us to the *Confession* of Faith, at the end of the *Council of Trent*; so may not we, with far greater reason, send you back to the *Apostolical Creed*? there being no objection which will hold against this being a *Catalogue* of our *Fundamentals*, but will hold against that *being a Catalogue of yours*. Nay, you assert such things your self concerning the necessity of believing things defined by the *Church*, as make it impossible for you to assign the definite number of such things, as are necessary for all persons, and therefore it is very unreasonable to demand it of us. For still, when you speak, that the things defined by the *Church*, are necessary to the Salvation of all, you add, *Where they are sufficiently propounded*; so that the measure of *Fundamentals* depends on the *sufficiency* of the *Proposition*. Now, will you undertake to assign what number of things are sufficiently propounded to the belief of all persons? Can you set down the exact bounds, as to all individuals, when their ignorance is inexcusable, and when not? Can §. 1. P. 45. n. 1.

you tell what the meaſure of their capacity was? what allowance *God* makes for the prejudices of Education, where there is a mind deſirous of inſtruction? Will you ſay, *God* accounts all thoſe things ſufficiently propoſed to mens belief, which you judge to be ſo? or, that all men are bound to think thoſe things neceſſary to Salvation, which you think ſo? by what means ſhall the *Churches* Power of defining matters of Faith, be ſufficiently propoſed to men as an Article of Faith? Either by its own Definition, or without? If by it; the thing is propoſed to be believed, which is ſuppoſed to be believed already, before that Propoſition; or elſe the Enquiry returns with as great force, Why ſhould I believe that Definition more than any other? if without it; then the ſufficiency of Propoſition, and the neceſſity of believing depends not on the *Churches* Definition. Theſe Queſtions I am apt to think *as pertinent* and *neceſſary* as yours was: and, now you know my ſenſe, and are ſo diſcontented you could never meet with a ſatisfactory Anſwer from *Proteſtants*, prevent the ſame diſſatisfaction in me, by giving a punctual Anſwer to ſuch neceſſary Queſtions. But, if you think the demands *unreaſonable*, becauſe they depend on ſuch things, which none can know but *God* himſelf; I pray accept of that as a ſatisfactory Anſwer to your own *very pertinent Queſtion*.

§. 2. But if the Queſtion be propounded not concerning *what things are Fundamental and neceſſary to particular perſons*, which on the reaſons formerly given, it is impoſſible to give a *Catalogue* of; but, *of ſuch things which are neceſſary to be owned for Chriſtian Communion*, as I have ſhewed this Queſtion of *Fundamentals* ought only to be taken here; then his Lordſhip's Anſwer was more pertinent than the Queſtion, *viz. That all the Points of the Creed were ſuch: For*, ſaith he, *Since the Fathers make the Creed the Rule of Faith; ſince the agreeing ſenſe of Scripture, with thoſe Articles, are the two Regular Precepts, by which a Divine is governed about the Faith; ſince your own Council of* Trent *decrees, That it is that principle of Faith, in which all that profeſs Chriſt, do neceſſarily agree*, & Fundamentum firmum & unicum, *not the firm only, but the only Foundation; ſince it is Excommunication* ipſo jure, *for any man to contradict the Articles contained in that Creed; ſince the whole body of Faith is ſo contained in the Creed, as that the ſubſtance of it was believed even before the coming of Chriſt; though not ſo expreſly as ſince, in the number of the Articles: Since* Bellarmin *confeſſes, That all things ſimply neceſſary for all mens Salvation, are in the Creed and Decalogue, What reaſon can you have to except?* Thus far his Lordſhip. Though from hence it appears, what *little reaſon* you have to except; yet becauſe *of that*, I expect your Exceptions the ſooner: and therefore very fairly paſſing by the ſenſe of the *Fathers*, you ask concerning the *Council* of *Trent*; *What if, that call the Creed the only Foundation*? Are you come to a *What if*, with the *Council* of *Trent*? But I ſuppoſe, it is not from *diſputing its Authority*, but *its meaning*; for you would ſeem to underſtand it only *of prime Articles of Faith, and not of ſuch as all are bound upon ſufficient Propoſition expreſly to believe*; for that is all the ſenſe I can make of your words. But, whoever was ſo ſilly, as to ſay, That all ſuch things which are to be believed on *ſufficient Propoſition* that they are revealed by *God*, are contained in the Creed? When you ſeem to imply, That this was the ſenſe the Queſtion was propounded in, it is a ſign you little attend to the Conſequence of things: when it is moſt evident, that the *Queſtion* was ſtarted concerning the *Greek Church*, and therefore muſt refer only to ſuch *Fundamentals*, as are neceſſary to be owned in order to the *Being* of a *true Church*. And when you can prove, that any other Articles are neceſſary to that, beſides thoſe contained in the *Creed*, you will do ſomething to purpoſe, but not before. But, you ſuppoſe *them to take the Creed in a very large ſenſe, who would lap up in the folds*

P. 42. ſect. 11. n. 1.

folds of it all particular points of Faith whatever: and I am ſure, this is not the ſenſe it is to be taken in here, nor that in which his Lordſhip took it. He ſaith indeed, *That if he had ſaid, that thoſe Articles only which are expreſſed in the Creed, are Fundamental, it would have been hard to have excluded the Scripture, upon which the Creed it ſelf in every Point is grounded. For nothing is ſuppoſed to ſhut out its own Foundation.* And this is built on very good reaſon. For the things contained in the *Creed* are propoſed as matters to be believed; all *Faith* muſt ſuppoſe a *Divine Teſtimony* revealing thoſe things to us, as the *ground* on which we believe them; this *Divine Teſtimony* is never pretended to be contained in the *Creed*; but that it is only a *ſummary Collection* of the moſt neceſſary Points which *God* hath revealed; and therefore ſomething elſe muſt be ſuppoſed as the ground and formal reaſon why we aſſent to the truth of thoſe things therein contained. So that the *Creed* muſt ſuppoſe the *Scripture*, as the main and only Foundation of believing the matters of Faith therein contained. But ſay you, *If all the Scripture be included in the Creed, there appears no great reaſon of ſcruple, why the ſame ſhould not be ſaid of Traditions, and other Points; eſpecially of that for which we admit Scripture it ſelf.* But, do you make no difference between the *Scripture* being ſuppoſed as the *ground* of *Faith*, and all *Scripture* being contained in the *Creed*? And doth not his Lordſhip tell you, *That though ſome Articles may be Fundamental, which are infolded in the Creed, it would not follow, that therefore ſome unwritten Traditions were Fundamental; for, though they may have Authority, and uſe, in the Church, as Apoſtolical, yet are they not Fundamental in the Faith.* And as for that Tradition, *That the Books of Holy Scripture are Divine, and Infallible in every part;* he promiſes to handle it, when he comes to the proper place for it. And there we ſhall readily attend what you have to object to what his Lordſhip ſaith about it.

P. 44. P. 45. n. 2.

§. 3.

But yet you ſay, *His Lordſhip doth not anſwer the Queſtion, as far as it was neceſſary to be anſwered*; we ſay, he doth. *No*, ſay you: *For the Queſtion ariſing concerning the Greek Churches error, whether it were Fundamental or no*; Mr. *Fiſher demanded of the Biſhop, What Points he would account Fundamental: to which he anſwers, That all Points contained in the Creed, are ſuch, but yet not only they; and therefore this was no direct Anſwer to the Queſtion; for, though the Greeks error was not againſt the Creed, yet it may be againſt ſome other Fundamental Article not contained in the Creed.* This you call *fine ſhuffling*. To which I anſwer, That when his Lordſhip ſpeak of its not being *Fundamentum unicum* in that ſenſe, to exclude all things not contained in the *Creed* from being Fundamental; he ſpake it with an immediate reſpect to the belief of *Scripture*, as an *Infallible Rule* of *Faith: For*, ſaith he, *The truth is, I ſaid, and ſay ſtill, That all the Points of the Apoſtles Creed, as they are there expreſſed, are Fundamental. And herein I ſay no more than ſome of your beſt learned have ſaid before me. But, I never ſaid or meant, that they only are Fundamental; that they are* Fundamentum unicum, *is the Council of* Trents, *'tis not mine. Mine is, That the belief of Scripture to be the word of God and Infallible, is an equal, or rather a preceding Principle of Faith, with, or to, the whole body of the Creed.* Now, what reaſon can you have to call this ſhuffling, unleſs you will rank the Greeks error equal with the denying *the Scripture to be the Word of God?* otherwiſe, his Lordſhips Anſwer is as full and pertinent, as your cavil is vain and trifling. His Lordſhip adds, *That this agrees with one of your own great Maſters,* Albertus Magnus, *who is not far from the Propoſition,* in terminis. To which your Exceptions are ſo pitiful, that I ſhall anſwer them without reciting them; for he that ſuppoſeth the ſenſe of Scripture, joyned with the Articles of Faith, to be the Rule of Faith, as

P. 45. P. 43. n. 2.

Albertus

Albertus doth, muſt certainly ſuppoſe the belief of the Scripture as the *Word of God*, elſe how is it poſſible its ſenſe ſhould be the Rule of Faith? Again, it is not enough, for you to ſay, That he believed other Articles of Faith, beſides thoſe in the *Creed*, but, that he made them a Rule of Faith together with the ſenſe of Scripture. 3. All this while here is not one word of Tradition, as the ground on which theſe Articles of Faith were to be believed. If this therefore be your way of anſwering, I know none will contend with you for *fine ſhuffling*. What follows concerning the right ſenſe of the Article of the *Deſcent of Chriſt into Hell*; ſince you ſay, *You will not much trouble your ſelf about it, as being not Fundamental either in his Lordſhips ſenſe, or ours*; I look on that expreſſion as ſufficient to excuſe me from undertaking ſo needleſs a trouble, as the examining the ſeveral ſenſes of it; ſince you acknowledge, *That no one determinate ſenſe is Fundamental*, and therefore not pertinent to our buſineſs. Much leſs is that which follows concerning Mr. *Rogers his Book and Authority*; in which, and that which depends upon it, I ſhall only give you your own words for an Anſwer, *That truly I conceive it of ſmall importance to ſpend much time upon this ſubject*; and ſhall not ſo far contradict my judgement as to do that, which, I think, when it is done, is to very little purpoſe. Of the ſame nature is that of *Catharinus*; for it ſignifies nothing to us, whether you account him an *Heretick* or no, who know, Men are not one jot more or leſs Hereticks, for your accounting them to be ſo or not.

P. 46. n. 4.

§. 4. You call the *Biſhop, your good friend, in ſaying, That all Proteſtants do agree with the Church of* England *in the main Exceptions, which they joyntly take againſt the* Roman *Church, as appears by their ſeveral Confeſſions. For* (ſay you) *by their agreeing in this, but in little or nothing elſe, they ſufficiently ſhew themſelves enemies to the true Church, which is one, and only one, by Unity of Doctrine; from whence they muſt needs be judged to depart, by reaſon of their Diviſions.* As *good a friend* as you ſay his Lordſhip was to you, in that ſaying of his, I am ſure you ill requite him for his *Kindneſs*, by ſo palpable a falſification of his words, and abuſe of his meaning. And all that *Friendſhip* you pretend, lyes only in your leaving out that part of the *Sentence*, which takes away all that you build on the reſt. For where doth his *Lordſhip* ſay, That the *Proteſtants only agree in their main Exceptions againſt the* Roman *Church, and not in their Doctrines?* Nay, doth he not expreſly ſay, *That they agree in the chiefeſt Doctrines, as well as main Exceptions, which they take againſt the Church of* Rome, *as appears by their ſeveral Confeſſions?* But you, very conveniently to your purpoſe, and with a *fraud* ſuitable to your *Cauſe*, leave out the firſt part of *agreement in the chiefeſt Doctrines*, and mention only the later, leſt your Declamation ſhould be ſpoiled as to your Unity, and our Diſagreements. But we ſee by this, by what means you would perſwade men of both, by Arts and Devices, fit only to deceive ſuch, who look only on the appearance and outſides of things; and yet even there, he that ſees not your growing *Diviſions*, is a great ſtranger to the Chriſtian world. Your great Argument of the *Unity* of your party, *becauſe, whatever the private Opinions of men are, they are ready to ſubmit their judgements to the cenſure and determination of the Church*; if it be good, will hold as well (or better) for our Unity, as yours, becauſe all men are willing to ſubmit their judgements to *Scripture*, which is agreed on all ſides to be *Infallible*. If you ſay, *That it cannot be known what Scripture determines, but it may be eaſily what the Church defines*: It is eaſily anſwered, that the event ſhews it to be far otherwiſe; for how many Diſputes are there, concerning the *Power* of determining matters of Faith? to whom it belongs, in what way it muſt be managed, whether parties ought to be heard in matters of Doctrine, what the mean-

P. 48. n. 6.

P. 50. n. 1.

P. 47. n. 4.

ing

ing of the *Decrees* are, when they are made, which raiſe as many Diviſions as were before them, as appears by the *Decrees* of the *Council* of *Trent*, and the later of *Pope Innocent* relating to the *five Propoſitions*: So that upon the whole it appears, ſetting aſide force and fraud (which are excellent principles of *Chriſtian Unity*) we are upon as fair terms of *Union* as you are among your ſelves.

You tell us, *That your Church doth Anathematize only ſuch perſons as are obſtinate*; but who are they whom ſhe accounts obſtinate? even all who diſſent from her in any *Punctilio*. And therefore this is a ſingular piece of Moderation in your *Church*. *And, you believe the troubles of Chriſtendom rather come from too great freedom taken in matters of Faith, than from any ſeverity in the Church of* Rome. The truth is, you have excellent ways of ending Controverſies, much like perſwading men to put out their *Eyes*, to end the Diſputes about the nature of *Colours*; and if they will not hearken to ſuch prudent counſel, they are pronounced *obſtinate* and *perverſe*, for offering to keep their *Eyes* in their *Heads*. And if men will not ſay, that *White* is *Black*, when your Church bids them do it, theſe men are the *troublers of Iſrael*, and the fomenters of the *Diſcords* of the *Chriſtian world*. But if your *Church* had kept to the primitive ſimplicity and moderation, and not offered to define matters of Faith; the occaſion of moſt of the Controverſies of the *Chriſtian world* had been taken away. Believe what you will, and ſpeak what you liſt; there are none who conſider what they believe or ſpeak, but eaſily diſcover whence the great Diſſentions of the Chriſtian world have riſen, *viz.* from the *Ambition* and *Uſurpation* of the *Church* of *Rome*, which hath not been contented to have introduced many ſilly Superſtitions into the publick exerciſe of Devotion; but, when any of theſe came to be diſcovered, thought it her beſt courſe to defend her corruptions with greater; by inforcing men to the *belief* of them, and thereby rendring a *Separation* from her Communion unavoidable by all thoſe who ſought to retrieve the Piety and Devotion of the Primitive *Church*. And yet this muſt be call'd *Schiſm*, and the perſons attempting it *Hereticks*, by that ſame *Pious and tender-hearted Mother of yours*, who loves her *Children* ſo dearly, that if they do but deſire any reformation of abuſes, ſhe takes all poſſible care they ſhall complain no more. As though the only way to prevent quarrelling in the world, were to cut out peoples *Tongues*, and cut off their *Arms*; Such a kind of *Unity* hath your *Church* ſhewed her ſelf very deſirous of, where-ever power and conveniency have met for the carrying it on. But, I hope, you will give us leave, not to envy the *Unity* of thoſe, who therefore agree in the *Church*, becauſe, as ſoon as they do in the leaſt differ from it, they are pronounced not to be of it, for oppoſing the determinations of it. And yet, notwithſtanding, the violence and fraud uſed in your *Church* to preſerve its *Unity*, the world is alarm'd with the noiſe of its Diſſentions, and the increaſe of the differing parties, who manage their Conteſts with great heats and animoſities againſt each other, under all the great pretences of your *Unity*. I cannot but therefore judge it a very prudent expreſſion of his Lordſhip, *That as the Church of* England *is not ſuch a Shrew to her Children, as to deny her bleſſing, or denounce an* Anathema *againſt them, if ſome peaceably diſſent in ſome particulars remoter from the Foundation: So, if the Church of* Rome, *ſince ſhe grew to her greatneſs, had not been ſo fierce in this courſe, and too particular in determining too many things, and making them matters of neceſſary belief, which had gone for many hundred of years before, only for things of pious Opinion; Chriſtendom (I perſwade my ſelf) had been in happier Peace at this day, than, I doubt, we ſhall ever live to ſee it.* And it is an excellent reaſon you give, why the *Church* of *Rome* doth impoſe her Doctrine on the whole

§. 5. p. 48. n. 6.

p. 50. n. i.

p. 49.

whole world, under pain of damnation; *becauſe it is not in her power to do otherwiſe.* There is little hopes then of amendment in her, if ſhe thinks ſo. But, you tell us, *Chriſt hath commanded her to do it.* What hath he commanded her to do? to add to his Doctrine by making things neceſſary, which he never made to be ſo? Is it in that place, where he bids the *Apoſtles, to teach all that he commanded them,* that he gives power to the Church, *to teach more than he commanded?* But this is a new kind of *Supererogation,* to make more Articles of Faith, than ever men were required to make. Where ſtill is this *Command* extant in *Scripture?* Not ſure any where, but in that moſt appoſite place produced to that, and all other good purpoſes which have nothing elſe to prove them; even *Dic Eccleſiæ, If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican*; therefore the *Church* of *Rome* is commanded by *Chriſt,* to impoſe her Doctrine on the whole *Church,* upon pain of damnation. Sure you will pronounce men *obſtinate,* that dare in the leaſt queſtion this, after ſo irrefragable a demonſtration of it. And you may well cry, *Scripture* is not fit to decide Controverſies, when you conſider the lame *Conſequences* you, above all men, derive from it.

§. 6. His Lordſhip ſhews the Moderation of the *Church* of *England,* even in
P. 51. n. 2. that *Canon* which *A. C.* looks on as the moſt ſevere, where ſhe pronounces Excommunication on ſuch as affirm, that the Articles are in any part ſuperſtitious or erroneous, *&c.* by theſe things. 1. *That it is not meant of mens private judgements, but of what they boldly and publickly affirm.* 2. *That it is one thing to hold contrary to ſome part of an Article; and another, poſitively to affirm, That the Articles in any part are ſuperſtitious or erroneous.* 3. *The Church of* England *doth this only for thirty nine Articles; but the Church of* Rome *doth it, for above a hundred in matter of Doctrine.* 4. *The Church of* England *never declared, That every one of her Articles are Fundamental in the Faith; but the Church of* Rome *requires, that all be believed as Fundamental, when once the Church hath determined them.* 5. *The Church of* England *preſcribes only to her own Children, and by thoſe Articles provides but for her own peaceable conſent in thoſe Doctrines of Truth. But the Church of* Rome *ſeverely impoſes her Doctrine upon the whole world, under pain of damnation.* To all theſe very conſiderable Inſtances of our *Churches* Moderation, your Anſwer is, *The Queſtion is not, Whether the* Engliſh *Congrega-*
P. 49. n. 3. *tion, or the* Roman *Church be more ſevere; but, Whether the* Engliſh *Proteſtants Severity be not unreaſonable; ſuppoſing ſhe be ſubject to error in defining thoſe Articles.* For after many words, to the ſame, *i. e.* little purpoſe, the reaſon you give for it, is, *That every uniuſt Excommunication inflicted for oppoſing of Doctrine, muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe the Doctrine oppoſed to be infallibly true, and abſolutely exempt from error; otherwiſe the Sentence it ſelf would be unreaſonable and unjuſt, as wanting ſufficient ground.* From whence you charge Proteſtants with greater *Tyranny* and *Injuſtice* towards their people, than they can with any colour or pretence of reaſon, charge upon the *Roman Church,* which excommunicates no man, but for denying ſuch Doctrine *as is both infallibly True, and alſo Fundamental, at leaſt as to its formal Object.* This is the ſtrength of all you ſay, which will be reduced to this ſhort Queſtion, Whether the proceedings of that *Church* be more unreaſonable, which excommunicates ſuch as openly oppoſe her Doctrine, ſuppoſing her *Fallible*; or of that *Church,* which excommunicates all who will not believe whatever ſhe defines to be *Infallibly true.* This is the true State of the *Controverſie,* which muſt be judged by the reſolving another Queſtion, whether it be not a more unreaſonable *Uſurpation,* to bind men upon pain of *damnation* hereafter, and excommunication here, to believe every thing *Infallible* which a *Church* defines, or to bind men to

peace

peace to a *Churches Determinations*, reſerving to men the liberty of their judgements, on pain of Excommunication, if they violate that peace. For it is plain on the one ſide, where a *Church pretends Infallibility*, the Excommunication is directed againſt the perſons for refuſing to give *Internal Aſſent* to what ſhe defines: But, where a *Church* doth not pretend to that, the Excommunication reſpects wholly that *Overt Act*, whereby the *Churches Peace* is broken. And if a *Church* be bound to look to her own Peace, no doubt ſhe hath power to *excommunicate* ſuch as openly violate the bonds of it; which is only an Act of Caution in a *Church*, to preſerve her ſelf in *Unity*; but where it is given out, that the *Church is Infallible*, the Excommunication muſt be ſo much the more unreaſonable, becauſe it is againſt thoſe *Internal Acts* of the mind, over which the *Church*, as ſuch, hath no direct power. And thus, I hope, you ſee how much more juſt and reaſonable the proceedings of our *Church* are than of yours; and that, *eo nomine*, becauſe ſhe pretends to be infallible, and ours doth not.

§. 7.

His Lordſhip ſhews further in *Vindication* of the *Church of* England, *and her grounds of Faith, that the Church of* England *grounded her Poſitive Articles upon Scripture; and her Negative do refute there, where the thing affirmed by them, is not affirmed by Scripture, nor directly to be concluded out of it. And this* (he ſaith) *is the main principle of all Proteſtants, that Scripture is ſufficient to Salvation, and contains in it all things neceſſary to it. The Fathers are plain, the Schoolmen not ſtrangers in it. And* Stapleton *himſelf confeſſes as much.* Nay, and you dare not deny it, as to all material Objects of Faith, and your formal here ſignifies nothing. And when *A. C.* ſaith, *That the Church of* England *grounded her Poſitive Articles upon Scripture, if themſelves may be Judges in their own cauſe.* His Lordſhip anſwers, *We are contented to be judged by the joint and conſtant belief of the Fathers, which lived within the firſt four or five hundred years after Chriſt, when the Church was at the beſt, and by the Councils held within thoſe times, and to ſubmit to them in all thoſe Points of Doctrine. This Offer* you grant to be *very fair*, and you do, *for your ſelves, promiſe the ſame, and ſay, You will make it good upon all occaſions.* Which we ſhall have tryal of before the end of this Book. To what his Lordſhip ſaith, concerning *the Negative Articles, That they refute where the thing affirmed by them is either not affirmed in Scripture, or not directly to be concluded out of it. A. C.* replies, *That the Baptiſm of Infants is not expreſly* (*at leaſt not evidently*) *affirmed in Scripture, nor directly* (*at leaſt not demonſtratively*) *concluded out of it.* Here two things his Lordſhip anſwers. 1. *To the Expreſſion.* 2. *To the thing.*

P. 52. & 53. n. 1.

P. 53. n. 2.

P. 51.

1. *To the Expreſſion*; *That he is no way ſatisfied with* A. C. *his addition* (*not expreſly, at leaſt not evidently:*) *for* (ſaith he) *What means he? If he ſpeak of the letter of Scripture, then whatſoever is expreſly, is evidently in the Scripture, and ſo his addition is in vain. If he ſpeak of the meaning of Scripture, then his addition is cunning. For many things are expreſly in Scripture, which yet in their meaning are not evidently there.* And as little ſatisfied his Lordſhip declares himſelf, with that other (*nor directly, at leaſt not demonſtratively,*) *becauſe many things are directly concluded, which are not demonſtratively.* To the firſt you anſwer, *That a Point may be expreſt, yet not evidently expreſt; otherwiſe there could be no doubt concerning what were expreſt in Scripture, ſince men never queſtion things that are evident. Now,* ſay you, *the Baptiſm of Infants muſt not only be expreſt, but evidently expreſt, to prove it ſufficiently,* i. e. *undeniably, by Scripture alone.* But the Queſtion being concerning *matters of Doctrine*, and not *meer words*, thoſe things are *expreſly* affirmed, which are *evidently*, and no other: For it is one thing for *words* to be *expreſly* in Scripture, and another for *Doctrines* to be ſo. For theſe later are no further *expreſly* affirmed there,

P. 54. n. 1.

P. 51. n. 9.

than as there is *evidence*, that the meaning of ſuch words doth contain ſuch a *Doctrine* in them. As to take your own Inſtance, *This is my Body*, we grant the words to be *expreſs*; but we deny, that which he had then in his hands was his *real Body*; (for his hands were part of his real Body) Now, we do not ſay, That the *Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation* is *expreſly*, but not *evidently* contained here; for, we ſay, The *Doctrine* is not there at all, but only that thoſe are the *expreſs words*; *This is my Body*; as it is in other figurative expreſſions in *Scripture*. But that which cauſeth this litigation about words, is, That you look upon that which is *evident* and *undeniable* to be all one, whereas there may be *ſufficient evidence*, where all men are not perſwaded by it. And ſo you would put his Lordſhip to prove out of *Scripture*, *Infant-Baptiſm evidently and demonſtratively*, *i. e. undeniably*; whereas his Lordſhip ſuppoſeth it enough for his purpoſe, to prove it by ſuch ſufficient evidence, as may convince any reaſonable man. And this was all his Lordſhip meant, when he ſaid, *That our Negative Articles do refute, where the thing is not affirmed in Scripture, or not directly concluded out of it.* And, if you will ſtand to the ſtrict ſenſe of theſe words, you will be forced to prove all thoſe Doctrines of your *Church*, which ours denies to be true, ſo *evidently and demonſtratively*, *i. e. undeniably*, as you would put him upon for the proof of *Infant-Baptiſm*.

§. 8. To leave therefore this verbal diſpute, and come to the *thing*: His
P. 55. n. 4. Lordſhip ſaith, *That it may be concluded directly out of Scripture, That Infants ought to be baptized, &c.* For which, he inſiſts *on two places of Scripture*, John 3. 8. *Except a man be born again of Water, and of the Spirit*, &c. *which being interpreted according to the ſenſe of the Fathers, and the Ancient Church, and as your own party acknowledge it ought to be interpreted, do evi-*
P. 52. n. 1. *dently aſſert Infant-Baptiſm.* By which, *your exception of a Pelagian Anabaptiſt, who denies Original ſin, and from thence ſaith, That Infants cannot be born again, is taken away*; for the ſame *Tradition* of the *Ancient Church*, which from hence infers the *Baptiſm of Infants*, doth it upon that ground, *becauſe they are guilty of Original ſin*, as you might have ſeen by his *Lordſhips Citations* to that purpoſe. The other place he inſiſts on, is,
P. 56. *Act.* 2. 38, 39. which, by the acknowledgement of *Ferus* and *Salmeron*, holds for *Infant-Baptiſm*. But, when you ſay, *That you would not weaken the Argument from* John 3. *for Infant-Baptiſm*; *becauſe you only would ſhew, that it cannot be proved demonſtratively from Scripture alone, againſt a perverſe Heretick*: You ſeem not much to conſider what thoſe *perverſe Hereticks* (as you call them) hold as to *Infant-Baptiſm*, which is, not meerly that *Infant-Baptiſm* is not commanded in *Scripture*, but that it is a thing *unlawful*, as being a perverting of the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, as to the ſubject of *Baptiſm*. For the main Queſtion between us and the *Antipædobaptiſts*, is not, concerning an abſolute and expreſs *command* for *Baptizing Infants*; but whether our *Bleſſed Saviour* hath not by a poſitive *Precept* ſo determined the ſubject of Baptiſm, *viz. adult perſons* profeſſing the Faith, that the alteration of the ſubject, *viz. in Baptizing Infants*, be not a deviation from, and perverſion of the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* in a *ſubſtantial part* of it; or in ſhort thus, whether our *Saviour* hath ſo determined the ſubject of Baptiſm, as to exclude *Infants*. And although, the queſtion being thus ſtated, the proof ought to lye on thoſe who affirm it, yet taking in only the help of *Scripture* and reaſon, it were no difficult matter to prove directly and evidently, that *Infants* are ſo far from being excluded *Baptiſm* by the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, that there are as many grounds as are neceſſary to a matter of that nature, to prove that the Baptizing them is ſuitable to the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, and agreeable to the *ſtate* of the *Church* under the *Goſpel*. For, if there were any ground to exclude them, it muſt be either

the

the *incapacity* of the *ſubject*, or ſome expreſs precept and *Inſtitution* of *our Saviour*. But neither of theſe can be ſuppoſed to do it.

1. Not incapacity as to the ends of *Baptiſm*: for clearing which, theſe two things muſt be premiſed: 1. *That the rule and meaſure, as to the uſe and capacity of Divine Inſtitutions, is to be fetched from the end of them.* For, this was the ground of the Circumciſion of the *Proſelytes* under the *Law*: and this was the way the *Apoſtles* did interpret *Chriſts Commiſſion* for Baptizing all Nations, as to the capacity of the ſubjects of it, Act. 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be Baptized, which have received the Holy Ghoſt, as well as we*: where the queſtion was concerning the *ſubject of Baptiſm*. For it might be made evident, that the *Apoſtles* at firſt did interpret their Commiſſion of *Baptizing all Nations*, only of the *Jews of all Nations*: for after that, S. *Peter* looked on the *Gentiles as unclean*: and the Diſciples at *Jeruſalem* charged S. *Peter* with it, as a great fault, *for going in to men uncircumciſed*, Acts 11. 3. Therefore we ſee when the queſtion was concerning the *ſubject* of *Baptiſm*; the only Argument is drawn from the *deſign* and *ends* of it; that they who were capable of the thing ſignified ought not to be denyed the uſe of the ſign. And thus by a parity of reaſon built on equal grounds, thoſe who are capable of the great things repreſented in *Baptiſm* and confirmed by it, *viz. Gods pardoning grace, and acceptation to eternal life*, ought not to be denied the external ſign, which is Baptiſm it ſelf. And therefore, 2. *Where there is a capacity as to the main ends of an Inſtitution, an incapacity as to ſome ends doth not exclude from it.* As is moſt evident in the Baptiſm of our *Bleſſed Saviour*, in whom there was a greater incapacity as to the main ends of Baptiſm, than poſſibly can be in *Infants*; for his *Baptiſm* could not at all be *for the remiſſion of ſins*. Now we ſee, although there were but one end, and that a very general one mentioned, *That he might fulfill all righteouſneſs*, Matth. 3. 15. yet we ſee, that was ſufficient to perſwade *John* to Baptize him. Whereby we ſee evidently in this practice of our *Saviour* built on a general and common ground, that a capacity as to one end of a poſitive *Inſtitution*, is ſufficient to make ſuch a practice lawful, and in ſome caſes a duty.

Theſe two general *Principles* being laid down; it were eaſie to ſhew, §. 9.
1. That what incapacity there is in *Infants*, is not deſtructive of the main ends of Baptiſm; which is chiefly thought to be the incapacity of underſtanding the nature or ends of the *Inſtitution*; and if that exclude, it muſt either be, that it is a thing repugnant to reaſon, that any Divine *Inſtitution* ſhould be applyed to perſons uncapable of underſtanding the nature and ends of it, which would highly reflect on the wiſdom of *God* in appointing Circumciſion for Children eight dayes old, who were certainly as uncapable of underſtanding the ends of that, as our *Children* are of Baptiſm; or elſe, that there is ſome peculiarity in the *Inſtitution* of Baptiſm, which muſt exclude them from it under the Goſpel: which that there is not, will appear preſently.

2. That *there is a capacity in Infants as to the main ends of Baptiſm*, which have either an aſpect from *God* to us, in regard of its *Inſtitution*, or from us to *God*, in regard of our *undertaking* it. Now the chief ends of a Divine Inſtitution as ſuch, are *ſuch* as reſpect *Gods* Intention in it towards us, in which reſpect it is properly a *ſign*; but as it reſpects *God* from us, it is properly a *Ceremony* betokening our profeſſion and reſtipulation towards *God*. Now the ends of it as a *ſign*, are to repreſent and exhibit to us the nature of the *grace* of the *Goſpel* as it cleanſeth and purifieth, and to confirm the truth of the *Covenant* on *Gods part*, and to enſtate the partakers of it in the priviledges of the *Church* of *God*; now as to all theſe ends, there is no incapacity in *Infants* to exclude them from Baptiſm, be-

cauſe of them. So that nothing can ſeem wanting of the *ends* of Baptiſm, but that which ſeems moſt *Ceremonial* in it, which is the perſonal *reſtipulation*, which yet may reaſonably be ſupplyed by *Sponſors*, ſo far as to make it of the nature of a ſolemn *Contract* and *Covenant* in ſight of the Congregation. Thus far it appears from *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, that no incapacity in *Infants* doth exclude them from Baptiſm.

2. That there is no direct or conſequential prohibition made by our *Bleſſed Saviour* to exclude them. For granting that he had the power to limit and determine the ſubject of *Baptiſm*, the queſtion is, Whether he hath ſo far done it as to exclude *Infants*? And nothing of that nature is pretended, before the laſt Commiſſion given to the *Apoſtles, of Teaching and Baptizing all Nations*, Matth. 28. 19. And that by this expreſſion there is no excluſion of *Infants* will appear; 1. If our *Saviour* had intended the gathering of *Churches* among the *Gentiles* according to the *Law of Moſes*, he could hardly have expreſſed it after another manner than thus, *Go Proſelyte all Nations, Circumciſing them.* Now I appeal to any mans judgement and reaſon, whether in ſuch words it could be imagined, that the *Infants* of ſuch *Gentile-Proſelytes* ſhould be excluded Circumciſion; and what reaſon can there be then from theſe words to imagine, that our *Saviour* did intend to exclude the Infants of *Gentile-Converts* from Baptiſm? 2. We muſt conſider, what apprehenſions thoſe whom our *Saviour* directed theſe words to, *viz.* the *Apoſtles*, had concerning the *Church-ſtate* of ſuch as were in an external Covenant with God, which they meaſured by the general reaſon of that *Covenant* which *God* made with the *Jews*; Can we then think, that when our *Saviour* bid the *Apoſtles* gather whole Nations into *Churches*, they ſhould imagine the *Infants* were excluded out of it, when they were ſo ſolemnly admitted into it, in that diſpenſation which was in uſe among them? 3. The *Gentiles* being now to be firſt *Proſelyted* to *Chriſtianity*, the order of the words was neceſſary: for who ever imagined, but that ſuch as were wholly ſtrangers to *Chriſtianity*, as thoſe were whom *Chriſt* there ſpeaks of, were to be *firſt taught*, or diſcipled, before they were to be Baptized? For ſuppoſe, it ſhould be ſaid to ſuch perſons among whom *Infant Baptiſm* is the moſt uſed, *Go and Diſciple the Indians, Baptizing them*, &c. could any one conceive the intention of ſuch a Commiſſion was to exclude the *Infants* of all thoſe *Indians* from *Baptiſm*, when it was well known that *Infant-Baptiſm* was uſed among thoſe who came with that Commiſſion? And therefore neither theſe words here, nor thoſe Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth and is Baptized*, &c. can in reaſon be ſo interpreted as to exclude *Infants*, when the meer order of nature, and neceſſity of the thing, requires that thoſe who firſt own *Chriſtianity* by being Baptized, ought, before ſuch *Baptiſm*, not only to believe, but to make profeſſion of that Faith; but this reacheth not at all to the caſe of ſuch *Infants* as are born of thoſe perſons. For if any one had ſaid to *Abraham, He that believes, and is circumciſed, ſhall be ſaved*, Could it have been ſo interpreted, that the intention was to exclude his *Children* from *Circumciſion*? No more ought theſe words of our *Saviour* be ſtrained to a greater prejudice of the right of *Infants* to Baptiſm, than thoſe other to their right of Circumciſion. And thus far we ſee there is no ground from *Scriptures*, or *Reaſon*, why Infants ſhould be excluded.

§. 10. And, were it not too large a Digreſſion, I might further ſhew how ſuitable the Baptiſm of *Infants* is to the adminiſtration of *things* under the *Goſpel*; but I ſhall only propound ſome conſiderations concerning it. 1. That if it had been *Chriſts intention* to exclude *Infants*, there had been far greater reaſon for an expreſs prohibition; than of an expreſs command, if his intention were to admit them: becauſe this was ſuitable to the general

neral grounds of *Gods dispensation* among them before. 2. It is very hard to conceive that the *Apostles* thought Infants excluded by *Christ*, when after *Christs Ascension* they looked on themselves as bound to observe the *Jewish customs*, even when they had Baptized many thousand people. 3. If admission of *Infants* to Baptism were a meer Relique of Judaism, it seems strange that none of the *Judaizing Christians* should be charged with it, who yet are charged with the observation of other *Judaical* rites. 4. Since the *Jewish Christians* were so much offended at the neglect of Circumcision, *Acts* 21. 21. Can we in reason think they should quietly bear their *Childrens* being wholly thrown out of the *Church*; as they would have been, if neither admitted to Circumcision nor Baptism? 5. Had it been contrary to *Christs Institution*, we should not have had such evidence of its early practice in the *Church* as we have. And here I acknowledge the use of *Apostolical Tradition* to manifest this to us; In which sense I acknowledge what St. *Austin* saith, *That the custom of our mother the Church is not to be contemned or thought superfluous, neither is it to be believed but as an Apostolical Tradition.* For that the words are to be read so, (and not, as you translate them, *nor at all to be believed unless it had been an Apostolical Tradition*, from thence inferring, that *Infant-Baptism were not to be believed at all, but for Tradition*) appears by three *ancient Manuscrips at Oxford*, as well as the course of the sentence, and St. *Austins* judgement in other places, *viz.* that it ought to be read, *Nec omninò credenda nisi Apostolica traditio esse*, and not *esset*. But we grant that the practice of the *Church* from *Apostolical times* is a great confirmation, that it was never *Christs intention* to have *Infants* excluded from *Baptism*. And thus much may suffice to shew, what evidence we have from *Scripture* and *Reason*, without recourse wholly to *Tradition*, or building upon any more controverted *places*, to justifie the *Churches practice in Infant-Baptism*, which is as much as is necessary for us to do. What follows concerning the founding *Divine Faith on Apostolical Tradition*, will be fully considered in the succeeding *Controversie* concerning the *resolution of Faith*, to which we now hasten.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The Romaniſts way of Reſolving Faith.

The ill conſequences of the reſolution of Faith by the Churches Infallibility. The grand Abſurdities of it, manifeſted by its great unreaſonableneſs in many particulars. The certain Foundations of Faith unſettled by it, as is largely proved. The Circle unavoidable by their new attempt. The impoſſibility of proving the Church Infallible by the way that Moſes, *Chriſt, and his Apoſtles were proved to be ſo. Of the Motives of Credibility, and how far they belong to the Church. The difference between Science and Faith conſidered, and the new art of mens believing with their wills. The Churches teſtimony muſt be, according to their principles, the formal object of Faith. Of their eſteem of Fathers, Scripture and Councils. The rare diſtinctions concerning the Churches infallibility diſcuſſed. How the Church can be Infallible by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, yet not divinely Infallible, but in a manner and after a ſort.* T. C. *applauded for his excellent faculty in contradicting himſelf.*

§. 1. HE that hath a mind to betray an *excellent Cauſe*, may more advantagiouſly do it, by bringing weak and inſufficient Evidences for it, than by the greateſt heat and vigour of Oppoſition againſt it. For there cannot poſſibly be any greater *prejudice* done to a weighty and important truth, than to perſwade men to believe it on ſuch *grounds*, which are, if not abſolutely falſe, yet much more diſputable than the thing it ſelf. For hereby the minds of men are taken off from the native evidence, which the *truth* enquired after offers to them, and build their aſſent upon the certainty of the *medium*'s ſuggeſted as the only grounds to eſtabliſh a firm aſſent upon. By which means, when upon ſevere enquiry, the falſity and inſufficiency of thoſe grounds is diſcovered, the perſon ſo diſcovering lies under a dangerous temptation of calling into *queſtion* the truth of that, which he finds he aſſented to upon *grounds* apparently weak and inſufficient. And the more refined and ſubtle the *ſpeculations* are, the more ſublime and myſterious the matters believed; the greater ſtill the danger of *Scepticiſm* is, upon a diſcovery of the unſoundneſs of thoſe principles which ſuch things were believed upon. Eſpecially, if the more confident and Magiſterial party of thoſe who profeſs the belief of ſuch things, do with the greateſt heat decry all other wayes as uncertain, and obtrude theſe principles upon the world, as the only ſure *foundation* for the belief of them. It was anciently a great queſtion among the *Philoſophers*, whether there were any certainty in the principles of knowledge; or, ſuppoſing certainty in things, whether there were any undoubted κριτηρια, or *rules* to obtain this certainty of knowledge by: If then any one *Sect* of *Philoſophers* ſhould have undertaken to prove the *certainty* that was in *knowledge* upon this account, becauſe *whatever their Sect or Party delivered was infallibly true*; they had not only ſhamefully beg'd the thing in diſpute, but made it much more lyable to queſtion than before. Becauſe every *error* diſcovered in that *Sect*, would not only prove the fondneſs and arrogance of their pretence of being *Infallible*; but would, to all ſuch as believed the certainty of things on the *authority* of their *Sect*, be an argument to diſprove all certainty of knowledge, when they once diſcovered the *errors* of thoſe whoſe authority they relyed upon. Juſt ſuch is the caſe of the *Church* of *Rome* in this preſent Controverſie concerning the *Reſolution of Faith.*

Faith. The queſtion is, *What the certain grounds of our aſſent are to the principles and rule of Chriſtian Religion?* The *Romaniſts* pretend, that there can be no ground of *True* and *Divine Faith* at all, but the Infallible teſtimony of Their *Church*; let then any rational man judge, whether this be not the moſt compendious way to overthrow the belief of *Chriſtianity* in the world? For our aſſent muſt be wholly ſuſpended upon that ſuppoſed *Infallibility*, which when once it falls (as it unavoidably doth upon the diſcovery of the leaſt error in the doctrine of that *Church*) what becomes then of the belief of Chriſtianity which was built upon that, as its only ſure foundation? So that it is hardly imaginable, there could be any deſign more really deſtructive to *Chriſtianity*, or that hath a greater tendency to *Atheiſm* than the modern pretence of *Infallibility*, and the *Jeſuits way of reſolving Faith.*

Which was the reaſon why his *Lordſhip* was *ſo unwilling to engage in that Controverſie, How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God:* not out of any diſtruſt he had of ſolving it upon *Proteſtant Principles*, as you vainly ſuggeſt; nor out of any fears of being left himſelf in that *Labyrinth*, which after all your endeavours you have loſt *your ſelf* and *your cauſe* in; as appears by your attempting this way, and that way to get out, and at laſt ſtanding in the very middle of that *Circle* you thought your ſelf out of. If his *Lordſhip* thought this *more a queſtion of curioſity than neceſſity*, it was becauſe out of his great Charity he ſuppoſed them to be *Chriſtians* he had to deal with. But if his charity were therein *deceived*, you ſhall ſee how able we are to make good the grounds of our *Religion* againſt all *Adverſaries*, whether *Papiſts* or others. And ſo far is the anſwering of this queſtion *from making the weakneſs of our Cauſe appear*, that I doubt not but to make it evident that our cauſe ſtands upon the ſame grounds which our common Chriſtianity doth; and that we are *Proteſtants* by the ſame reaſon that we are *Chriſtians*. And on the other ſide, that you are ſo far from giving *any true grounds of Chriſtian Faith*, that nothing will more advance the higheſt *Scepticiſm* and *Irreligion*, than ſuch Principles as you inſiſt on for reſolving Faith. The true reaſon then, why the *Archbiſhop* declared any unwillingneſs to enter upon this diſpute, was not the leaſt apprehenſion *how inſuperably hard the reſolution of this queſtion was*, (as you pretend) but becauſe of the great miſchief your Party had done in ſtarting ſuch queſtions you could not reſolve with any ſatisfaction to the common reaſon of mankind; and that you run your ſelves into ſuch a *Circle* in which you *conjure* up more *Spirits* than ever you are able to *lay*, by giving thoſe advantages to Infidelity, which all your *Sophiſtry* can never anſwer on thoſe principles you go upon. That this was the true ground of his Lordſhips ſeeming averſeneſs from this Controverſie, appears by his plain words, where he tells you at firſt, *of the danger of mens being diſputed into infidelity by the Circle between Scripture and Tradition, and by his expreſſing his ſenſe of the great harm you have done by the ſtarting of that queſtion among Chriſtians, How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God.* But although in this reſpect he might be ſaid *to be drawn into it*, yet leſt you ſhould think his averſeneſs argued any conſciouſneſs of his own inability to anſwer it, you may ſee how cloſely he follows it; with what care and accuracy he handles it, with what ſtrength of reaſon and evidence he hath diſcovered the weakneſs of your way, which he hath done with that ſucceſs, that he hath put you to miſerable ſhifts to avoid the force of his arguments, as will appear afterwards. I am therefore fully of his mind, *that it is a matter of ſuch conſequence it deſerves to be ſifted*, were it for no other end, but to lay open the juglings and impoſtures of your way of reſolving Faith.

§. 2.

Pag. 55.

Sect. 16. n. 1.

Which

§. 3. Ibid. Which we now come more cloſely to the diſcovery of; for, as you tell us, *The Biſhop propounding diverſe wayes of reſolving the Queſtion, firſt falls to the attaquing your way, who prove it by Tradition and authority of the Church.* And his firſt onſet is ſo ſucceſsful that it makes you viſibly *recoyle*, and withdraw your ſelf into ſo untenable a Shelter as expoſeth you to all the attempts which any adverſary would deſire to make upon you. For, whereas you are charged by his *Lordſhip with running into the moſt abſurd kind of argumentation*, viz. *by proving the Scriptures infallible by Tradition, and that Tradition infallible by Scripture*; you think to eſcape that *Circle* by telling us, *That you prove not the Churches Infalliblity by the Scripture, but by the motives of credibility belonging to the Church.* This then being your main principle which your following diſcourſe is built upon, and in your judgement the *only probable way to avoid the Circle*, that you may not think I am afraid of encountering you in your greateſt ſtrength, I dare put the iſſue of the cauſe upon this Promiſe that (beſides the weak proofs you bring for the thing it ſelf, which ſhall after be conſidered) if this way of yours be not chargeable with all the abſurdities ſuch an attempt is capable of, I will be content to acknowledge what you ſay to be true, which is, *That your way of reſolving Faith hath no difficulty at all, and that ours is inſuperably hard*, which I think are as hard terms as can be impoſed upon me. Now there are two grand Abſurdities, which any vindication of an Opinion is ſubject to; firſt, *If it be manifeſtly unreaſonable*, and, 2. *If ſuppoſing it true, it doth not effect what it was intended for*: now theſe *two* I undertake to make good againſt this *way of your reſolving Faith*, that it is guilty of the higheſt unreaſonableneſs; and that, ſuppoſing it true, you are in a *circle* as much as before.

1. Firſt, I begin with the *unreaſonableneſs* of it, which is ſo great, that I know not, whether I may abſtain from calling it *ridiculous*; but, that I may not ſeem to follow you, in aſſerting confidently, and proving weakly, it will be neceſſary throughly to examine the *grounds* on which your opinion ſtands, and then raiſe our *batteries* againſt it. Three grand *principles* your diſcourſe relies upon, which are your *poſtulata* in order to the reſolving Faith.

1. That it is neceſſary to the believing the *Scriptures to be the Word of God with a Divine Faith*, that it be built on the infallible teſtimony of the *Church*.

2. That your *Church* is that *Catholick Church* whoſe teſtimony is *Infallible*.

3. That this *Infallibility* is to be known and aſſented to upon the *motives of credibility*. Theſe three, I ſuppoſe, if your confuſed diſcourſe were reduced to method, would be freely acknowledged by your ſelf to be the Princip'es on which *your reſolution of Faith* depends. And although I am ſufficiently aſſured of the falſeneſs of your two firſt *Principles* (as will appear in the ſequel of this diſcourſe) yet that which I have now particularly undertaken, is, the *unreaſonableneſs of reſolving Faith* upon theſe Principles taken together, *viz. That the Infallible Teſtimony of your Church, is the only Foundation for Divine Faith; and that this Infallibility can be known only by the Motives of Credibility.* If then in this *way of reſolving Faith*, you require *Aſſent beyond all proportion of evidence*, if you *run into the ſame Abſurdities you would ſeem to avoid*, if you *leave men more uncertain in their Religion than you found them*; you cannot certainly excuſe this way from *unreaſonableneſs*. And each of theſe I undertake to make good againſt this *way* of yours, whereby you would aſſure men of the *Truth* and *Divinity* of the *Scriptures*.

1. *An*

§. 4. 1. *An Assent is hereby required beyond all proportion or degree of evidence*; for you require an *Infallible Assent*, only upon *Probable grounds*; which is as much as requiring Infallibility in the conclusion, where the premises are only probable. Now that you require an Assent *Infallible* to the nature of Faith, appears by the whole *series* of your Discourse: for, to this very end you require *Infallibility* in the *Testimony* of your *Church*, because otherwise, you say *Our Faith would be uncertain*; it is plain then, you require an *Infallible Assent* in Faith; and, it is as plain, that this *Assent*, according to you, can be built only upon *probable grounds*, for you acknowledge the *motives of Credibility*, to be no more than such; yet those are all the grounds you give why the *Church* should be believed Infallible. If you say, *That which makes the Assent Infallible, is, that Infallibility which is in the Churches Testimony*; I reply, That this is a most unreasonable thing, to go about to establish an *Infallible Assent*, meerly because the *Testimony* is supposed to be in it self *Infallible*: For, *Assent* is not according to the *Objective Certitude* of things, but the *evidence* of them to our *Understandings*. For is it possible to assent to the truth of a Demonstration in a demonstrative manner, because any *Mathematician* tells one, The thing is demonstrable? for in that case the *Assent* is not according to the *Evidence* of the thing, but according to the opinion such a person hath of him, who tells him, It is demonstrable. Nay, supposing that person *infallible* in saying so, yet if the other hath no means to be *infallibly assured*, that he is so, such a ones *Assent* is as *doubtful*, as if he were not infallible: Therefore, supposing the *Testimony* of your *Church* to be really infallible, yet since the means of believing it are but *probable* and *prudential*, the Assent cannot be according to the *nature* of the *Testimony*, considered in it self, but according to the *reasons* which induce me to believe such a Testimony infallible. And in all such cases, where I believe one thing for the sake of another, my *Assent* to the *Object* believed, is according to my Assent to the *Medium* on which I believe it; for by the means of that, the other is conveyed to our minds. As our sight is not according to the light in the body of the *Sun*, but that which presseth upon our Organs of sense: So that, supposing your *Churches* Testimony to be in it self *infallible*, if one may be deceived in judging whether your *Church* be *infallible* or no, one may be deceived in such things which he believes upon that supposed *Infallibility*. It being an impossibility, that the *Assent* to the *matters of Faith*, should rise higher, or stand firmer, than the Assent to the *Testimony* is, upon which those things are believed. Now, that one may be deceived according to your own principles, in judging whether the *Church* be *Infallible*, appears by this, That you have no other means to prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, but only *probable* and *prudential Motives*. For, I desire to know, whether an *Infallible Assent* to the Infallibility of your *Church*, can be grounded on those *Motives of Credibility*? If you affirm it, then there can be no imaginable necessity, to make the *Testimony* of your *Church Infallible*, in order to *Divine Faith*; for you will not, I hope, deny, but that there are at least equal *Motives of Credibility*, to prove the *Divine Authority* of the *Scriptures*, as the *Infallibility* of your *Church*; and if so, why may not an *Infallible Assent* be given to the *Scriptures* upon those *Motives of Credibility*, as well as to your *Churches Infallibility*? If you deny the Assent built upon the *Motives of Credibility* to be *Infallible*; how can you make the Assent to your Churches Testimony to be *infallible*, when that Infallibility is attempted to be proved only by the *Motives of Credibility*? And therefore it necessarily follows, That notwithstanding your bearing it so high under the pretence of Infallibility, you leave mens minds much more wavering in their Assent than before; in that, as shall afterwards appear, these very *Motives of Credibility* do not

at all prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, which undoubtedly prove the *Truth* and *Certainty* of *Chriſtian Religion*. Thus, while by this device, you ſeek to avoid the *Circle*, you deſtroy the Foundation of your Diſcourſe, *That there muſt be an Infallible Aſſent to the truth of that Propoſition, That the Scriptures are the Word of God* (which you call *Divine Faith*) which, how can it be *Infallible*, when that *Infallibility*, at the higheſt, by your own confeſſion, is but *evidently credible*, and ſo, I ſuppoſe the *Authority* of the *Scriptures* is, without your *Churches Infallibility*.

§. 5. And thus *you run into the ſame Abſurdities which you would ſeem to avoid*, which is the ſecond thing, to manifeſt the unreaſonableneſs of this way; for whatever *Abſurdity* you charge us with, for believing the *Doctrine of Chriſt* upon the *Motives of Credibility*, unavoidably falls upon your ſelves for believing the *Churches Infallibility* on the ſame grounds: for if we leave the *Foundation of Faith uncertain*, you do ſo too; if we build a *Divine Faith upon the Motives of Credibility*, ſo do you; if we make *every ones reaſon the Judge in the choice of his Religion*, ſo muſt you be forced to do, if you underſtand the conſequence of your own principles.

1. It is impoſſible for you to give *a better account of Faith by the Infallibility of your Church, than we can do without it*; For, if *Divine Faith* cannot be built upon the *Motives* proving the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, what ſenſe or reaſon is there, that it ſhould be built on thoſe *Motives* which prove your *Churches Infallibility*? So that, if we leave *the Foundation of Faith uncertain*, you much more; and that I prove by a Rule of much Authority with you, by which you uſe to pervert the weak judgements of ſuch, who in your caſe do not diſcern the *Sophiſtry* of it: Which is when you come to deal with perſons, whom you hope to *Proſelyte*, you urge them with this great *Principle*, That *Prudence is to be our Guide in the choice of our Religion, and that Prudence directs us to chuſe the ſafeſt way, and that it is much ſafer to make choice of that way, which both ſides agree Salvation is to be obtained in, than of that which the other ſide utterly denies men can be ſaved in*. How far this Rule will hold in the choice of Religion, will be examined afterwards: but if we take your word, that it is a ſure Rule; I know nothing will be more certainly advantagious to us, in our preſent caſe. For both ſides, I hope, are agreed, that there are *ſufficient Motives of Credibility*, as to the belief of the *Scriptures*; but we utterly deny that there are any ſuch *Motives* as to the *Infallibility* of your *Church*; it then certainly follows, That our way is the more eligible and certain, and that we lay a ſurer *Foundation for Faith*, than you do upon your principles for reſolving Faith.

2. Either you muſt deny *any ſuch thing as that you call Divine Faith*; or you muſt aſſert, that it may have no other *Foundation* than the *Motives of Credibility*, which yet is that, you would ſeem moſt to avoid by introducing the *Infallibility of your Church, that the Foundation of Faith may not be uncertain*; whereas, ſuppoſing what you deſire, you muſt of neceſſity do what you would ſeem moſt fearful of, which is making a *Divine Faith to reſt upon prudential Motives*. Which I thus prove: It is an undoubted *Axiom* among the great men of your ſide, That *whatever is a Foundation for a Divine Faith, muſt it ſelf be believed with a firm, certain, and infallible Aſſent*: Now, according to your principles, the *Infallibility* of the *Church* is the Foundation for Divine Faith; and therefore that muſt be believed with an *Aſſent infallible*. It is apparent then, an *Aſſent Infallible* is required, which is that which in other terms you call *Divine Faith*; now when you make it your buſineſs to prove the *Churches Infallibility* upon your *prudential Motives*, I ſuppoſe your deſign is by thoſe proofs, to induce men to believe it; and if men then do believe it upon thoſe *Motives*, do you not found an *Aſſent Infallible*, or a *Divine Faith*, upon the *Motives of Credibility*?

bility? And by the same reason that you urge against us the necessity of believing *the Scriptures to be the word of God by Divine Faith*; because it is the *ground* why we *believe the things contained in the Scripture*, we press on your side the necessity of believing the *Infallibility of the Church by a Faith equally Divine*, because that is to you the only sufficient Foundation of believing the *Scriptures*, or any thing contained in them.

3. You make by this way of resolving Faith, *every mans reason the only Judge in the choice of his Religion*: which you are pleased to charge on us as a great *Absurdity*: yet, you who have deserved so *very ill* of *Reason*, are fain to call in her best assistance in a case of the greatest moment, *viz. On what ground we must believe the Scriptures to be the word of God.* You say, *Because the Church is infallible, which delivers them to us*; but how should we come to know that she is infallible? you tell us, *By the Motives of Credibility*; very good: But must not every ones reason judge whether these *Motives* be *credible* or no? and whether they belong peculiarly to your *Church*, so as to prove the *Infallibility* of it, as it is distinct from all other societies of *Christians* in the world? You tell us indeed, That these *Motives* make it *evidently credible*; but must we believe it to be so, *because you say so*? If so; then the ground of *believing* is not the *Credibility* of the *Motives*, but of *your Testimony*, and therefore you ought to make it *evidently true*, that whatever you speak is undoubtedly true, which whosoever reads your Book, will hardly be perswaded to. So that of necessity every *mans reason* must be *Judge*, whether your *Church be infallible* or no; and thus at last you give Reason the *Umpirage* in the choice of Religion. And what is there more than this that we contend for? If there be then any danger of *Scepticism*, a *private spirit*, or what other inconveniencies you object against our way of judging the truth of *Religion* by *the Use of Reason*, it will fall much more heavily upon your selves, in this way of believing the *Infallibility of the Church* on the *Motives of Credibility*. Therefore I assure you, it were much more consonant to the principles of your party, to tell men, *The Infallibility of your Church ought to be taken for granted, and that men are damned for not believing it, though no reason be given for it, but only because you say it* (which is as much as to say, the reason of the Point is, It must needs be so) than thus to expose it to the scorn and contempt of the world, by offering to prove it by your *Motives of Credibility*. For unawares you thereby give away the main of your Cause; for by the very offer of proving it, you make *him* whom you offer to prove it to, *judge* whether these *proofs be sufficient or no*? and if he be capable to *judge* of his *Guide*, certainly he may be of his *Way* too, considering that he hath, according to us, an *Infallible Rule* to judge of his Way; whereas, according to you, he hath but *Prudential Motives* in the choice of his Guide. Thus, by this Opinion of yours, you have gained thus much, That there is nothing so *absurd*, which you charge upon us, but it falls unavoidably upon your own head.

By this way of resolving Faith, you undermine it; and leave a sure Foundation for nothing but *Scepticism*; which is the last thing to shew the great *unreasonableness* of this way of yours, that when you are making us believe you are taking the greatest care to make our *Religion sure*, you *cancel* our best *evidences*, and produce nothing but *crackt and broken titles*, which will not stand any fair tryal at the *bar* of *Reason*. And that you make the Foundations of Religion uncertain, I offer to prove *by the reason of the thing*; for, if you require that as necessary for Faith, which was never believed to be so, when the Doctrine of Faith was revealed; if upon the pretence of *Infallibility* you assert such things, which destroy all the *rational* evidence of *Christian Religion*, and if at last you are far from giving the least satisfactory account concerning this *Infallibility of your Church*; then certainly we may justly charge you with §. 6.

unſetling the Foundations of Religion, inſtead of giving us a *certain reſolution of Faith*.

1. *You make that neceſſary to Faith; which was not looked on as ſuch, when the Doctrine of the Goſpel was revealed*; and what other deſign can ſuch a pretence ſeem to have, than to expoſe to contempt that *Religion* which was not received by a *true Divine Faith*, becauſe it wanted that, which is now thought to be the only *ſure Foundation of Faith*, viz. *the Infallibility of the Church of* Rome? What then will become of the *Faith* of all thoſe who received *Divine Revelations*, without the *infallible Teſtimony of any Church at all*? With what *Faith* did the *Diſciples* of *Chriſt* at the time of his ſuffering, believe the *Divine Authority of the Old Teſtament*? was it a *true Divine Faith* or not? If it *was*, whereon was it built? not certainly on the *Infallible Teſtimony of the Jewiſh Church*, which at that time conſented to the *death of the Meſſias*, condemning him as a malefactor and deceiver: Or did they believe it becauſe of that great *Rational Evidence* they had to convince them, that thoſe *Prophecies* came from *God*? If ſo, why may not we believe the *Divinity* of all the *Scriptures* on the ſame grounds, and with a *Divine Faith* too? With what *Faith* did thoſe believe in the *Meſſias*, who were not perſonally preſent at the *Miracles* which our *Saviour* wrought, but had them conveyed to them by ſuch reports as the *woman of Samaria* was to the *Samaritans*? Or were all ſuch perſons excuſed from believing, meerly becauſe they were not *Spectators*? But by the ſame reaſon all thoſe would be excuſed, who never ſaw our *Saviour's* miracles, or heard his Doctrine, or his *Apoſtles*: But if ſuch perſons then were bound to believe, I ask On what Teſtimony was their *Faith* founded? Was the *woman of Samaria infallible*, in reporting the diſcourſe between *Chriſt* and her? Were all the perſons *infallible*, who gave an account to others of what *Chriſt* did? yet, I ſuppoſe, had it been your own caſe, you would have thought your ſelf bound to have believed *Chriſt* to have been the *Meſſias*, if you had lived at that time, and a certain account had been given you of our *Saviour's Doctrine* and *Miracles* by men faithful and honeſt, though you had no reaſon to have believed them *infallible*: I pray, Sir, anſwer me, would you have thought your ſelf bound to have believed, or no? If you affirm it (as I will ſuppoſe you ſo much a Chriſtian as to ſay ſo) I pray then tell me, whether perſons in thoſe circumſtances might not have a *True and Divine Faith*, where there was no *infallible Teſtimony*, but only *Rational Evidence* to build it ſelf upon? And if thoſe perſons might have a *Divine faith* upon ſuch evidence as that was, may not we much more, who have evidence of the *ſame nature* indeed, but much more *extenſive*, *univerſal*, and *convincing* than that was? And how then can you ſtill aſſert an *infallible Teſtimony* of the conveyers of *Divine Revelation*, to be neceſſary to a *Divine Faith*? Nay further yet, How very few were there in compariſon, in the firſt *Ages* of the *Chriſtian Church*, who received the Doctrine of the *Goſpel* from the mouths of perſons infallible? And of thoſe who did ſo, what certain evidence have men, That all thoſe perſons did receive the Doctrine upon the account of the *Infallibility* of the propounders, and not rather upon the *Rational Evidence* of the *Truth of the Doctrine* delivered; and whether the belief of their *Infallibility* was abſolutely neceſſary to Faith, when the report of the *Evidences* of the *Truth* of the Doctrine might raiſe in them an obligation to believe, ſuppoſing them not *infallible* in that delivery of it; but that they looked on them as honeſt men, who faithfully related, *what they had ſeen and heard*. And this ſeems the more probable, in that the *Apoſtles* themſelves, in their undoubtedly divine writings, do ſo often appeal to their own *ſufficiency* and *integrity*, without pleading ſo much their *Infallibility*. S. *John* ſaith, *That which we have ſeen and heard, and handled, declare we unto you*. S. *Peter*

1 Joh. 1. 1.

appeals

appeals to his being *an Eye-witneſs*, to make it appear he delivered *no cunningly deviſed fables*. S. *Luke* makes this a ground, *That the things were ſurely believed, becauſe delivered from them who were Eye-witneſſes and Miniſters of the Word.* If they inſiſted ſo much upon this *Rational Evidence*, and ſo ſparingly on their own *Infallibility*; certainly they thought the one afforded a good foundation for *Faith*, though the other, after believing it, might highly advance it. And therefore I ſuggeſt not theſe things, in the leaſt, to queſtion the *Infallibility* of the *Apoſtles*, but to let us ſee, that even at that time, when there was a *certainly infallible Teſtimony*, yet that is not urged as the only Foundation for Faith, but *Rational Evidence* produced even by thoſe perſons who were thus infallible. If we deſcend lower in the *Chriſtian Church*, or walk abroad to view the ſeveral *Plantations* of the *Churches* at that time, Where do we read or meet with the leaſt intimation of an *infallible Teſtimony* of the *Catholick Church*, ſo call'd from its *Communion* with that of *Rome*? What infallible Teſtimony of that *Church* had the poor *Britains* to believe on? or thoſe *Barbarians* mentioned in *Irenæus*, who yet believed without a *written word*? What mention do we meet with, in all the ancient *Apologeticks* of *Chriſtians*, wherein they give ſo large an account of the grounds of *Chriſtian Faith*, of the modern method for *reſolving Faith*? Nay, what one ancient *Father* or *Council* give the leaſt countenance to this pretended *Infallibility*, much leſs make it the only ſure *Foundation of Faith*, as you do? Nay, how very few are there among your ſelves who believe it, and yet think themſelves never the worſe *Chriſtians* for it? If then your *Doctrine* be true, what becomes of the *Faith* of all theſe perſons mentioned? Upon your principles their *Faith* could not be a *true and Divine Faith*; that is, *Let them all think they believed the Doctrine of Chriſt never ſo heartily, and obeyed it never ſo conſcientiouſly; yet becauſe they did not believe it on the Infallibility of your Church, their Faith was but a kind of gilded and ſplendid Infidelity, and none of them Chriſtians, becauſe not Jeſuits.* And doth not this principle then fairly advance *Chriſtianity* in the world, when the belief of it comes to be ſetled on Foundations never heard of in the beſt and pureſt times of it; nay, ſuch Foundations, as for want of their believing them, their *Faith muſt be all in vain, and Chriſt dyed in vain for them?*

2 Pet. 1. 16
Luk. 1. 1, 2.

2. You aſſert ſuch things upon the pretence of Infallibility, *which deſtroy all the rational evidence of Chriſtian Religion*: And what greater diſ-ſervice could you poſſibly do to it, than by taking away all the proper grounds of *certainty* of it? And, inſtead of building it *ſuper hanc Petram*, upon the *Rock of Infallibility*, you do it only upon a *Quick-ſand*, which *ſwallows* up the *Edifice*, and *ſucks* in the *Foundations* of it. You would have men to believe the Infallibility of your *Church*, that their *Faith* might ſtand upon ſure *grounds*; and yet, if men believe this *Infallibility of your Church*, you require ſuch things to be believed upon it, which deſtroy all kind of *certainty in Religion*. And that I prove by ſome of thoſe principles which are received among you upon the account of the *Churches Infallibility*. §. 7.

1. *That the judgement of Senſe is not to be relyed on, in matters of Faith*: This is the great Principle upon which the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* ſtands in your *Church*; and this is all, the moſt conſiderative men among you have to ſay, when all thoſe *Contradictions* are offered to them, which that Doctrine is ſo *big* of, both to the judgement of ſenſe and reaſon, *viz. That though it ſeem ſo contradictory; yet becauſe the Church, which is infallible, delivers it, they are bound not to queſtion it.* If this Principle then be true, That the judgement of ſenſe is not to be relyed on, in matters which ſenſe is capable of judging of; it will be impoſſible for any one to give any ſatisfactory account of the grand *Foundations of Chriſtian Faith*. For if we care-

carefully examine the *grounds of Certainty in Chriſtian Religion*, we find the great appeal made to the *judgement of Senſe*, (*That which we have ſeen, and heard, and handled.*) If then the judgement of *Senſe* muſt not be taken in a *proper object*, at *due diſtance*, and in ſuch a thing wherein *all mens Senſes* are equally Judges; I pray, tell me what aſſurance the *Apoſtles* could have, or any from them, of any *miracles* which *Chriſt* wrought, of any *Doctrine* which he preached; eſpecially becauſe in his *miracles* there was ſomething above nature, in which caſe men are more apt to ſuſpect *Impoſtures*, than in things which are the continual *Objects of Senſe*, as in the caſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*? Wherein, if men are not bound to rely on the judgement of Senſe, you muſt ſay, that *our Faculties are ſo made*, that they may be impoſed upon, in the proper *Objects* of them; and if ſo, farewel all *Certainty*, not only in *Religion*, but in all things elſe in the world. For what aſſurance can I have of the knowledge of any thing, if I find that my *Faculties* not only may be, but I am bound to believe that they *actually are*, deceived in a thing that is as proper an *Object of Senſe*, as any in the world. And if a thing, which the judgement of all mankind (thoſe excepted who have given away their ſenſe and reaſon in this preſent caſe) doth unanimouſly concur in, may be *falſe*; What evidence can we have, when any thing is *true*? For, if a thing ſo plain and evident to our *Senſes* may be *falſe*, *viz.* That *what I and all other men ſee, is bread*, what ground of *certainty* can we have, but that which my *Senſes*, and all other mens judge to be *falſe*, may be *true*? For by this means you take away the κριτηριον both of *Senſe* and *Reaſon* in *things*, and conſequently, *all things are equally true and falſe to us*; and thence it follows, That *Truth* and *Falſhood* are but *Fancies*, that our *Faculties* have no means to difference the one from the other, that in things we all agree in, as proper objects of *Senſe*, we not only may be, but are deceived; and then farewel *Senſe*, *Reaſon and Religion together*. For, I pray, Tell me what *Aſſurance* could the *Apoſtles* have of the *Reſurrection of Chriſt's Individual Body* from the grave, but the *Judgement of Senſe*? What ways did he uſe to convince them, that he was not a *Spectre* or *Apparition*, but by an appeal to their *Senſes*? by what means did he reclaim *Thomas* from his Infidelity, but by bidding him make uſe of his *Senſes*? If *Thomas* had believed *Tranſubſtantiation*, he would eaſily have anſwered our *Saviours* Argument, and told him, If there were not a *productive*, yet there might be an *Adductive Tranſmutation* of ſome other perſon into him: And the Diſciples might all have ſaid, It was *true*, there were *the accidents of Chriſt's Body*, the *external ſhape and figure* of it; but, for all they could diſcern, there might be ſome *Inviſible Spirit* under thoſe *external accidents of ſhape*: and therefore they muſt deſire to be excuſed from believing it *to be his Body*; for, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, had told them already; *That the external accidents might remain, where the ſubſtance was changed.* Now therefore, when the Aſſurance of *Chriſtian Religion* came from the judgement of the Senſes of thoſe who were *Eye-witneſſes* of the *Miracles* and the *Reſurrection of Chriſt*; if the Senſes of men may be ſo groſly deceived in the proper *Objects* of them in the caſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*, what aſſurance could they themſelves have, who were *Eye-witneſſes* of them? and how much leſs aſſurance can we have, who have all our *Evidence* from the certainty of their report? So that it appears upon the whole, that, take away the certainty of the *judgement of Senſe*, you deſtroy all *Certainty in Religion*; for, Tradition only conveys to us now, what was originally grounded upon the *judgement of Senſe*, and delivers to us in an undoubted manner, that which the *Apoſtles ſaw and heard*. And do not you then give a very good account of Religion by the Infallibity of your *Church*; when, if I believe your *Church* to be infallible, I muſt by vertue of that Infallibility, believe ſomething

thing to be *true*, which if it be *true*, there can be no *certainty* at all of the *Truth* of *Christian Religion*.

§. 8. 2. Another principle is, *That we can have no certainty of any of the grounds of Faith, but from the Infallibility of your present Church.* Whereby *you* do these two things. 1. Destroy the *obligation* to *Faith* which ariseth from the *rational evidence of Christian Religion*. 2. Put the whole *stress* of the *truth of Christianity* upon the proofs of your *Churches Infallibility*; by which things any one may easily see what tendency your doctrine of *resolving Faith* hath, and how much it designs the overthrow of *Christianity*. 1. You destroy the *obligation to Faith from the rational evidence of Christian Religion*, by telling men, as you do expressly in the very Title of your *next Chapter*, *That there can be no unquestionable assurance of Apostolical Tradition, but for the infallible authority of the present Church.* If so, then men cannot have any unquestionable assurance that there was such a *Person* as *Christ* in the world, that he wrought such great *miracles* for confirmation of his Doctrine, that he *dyed and rose again*; it seems we can have no assurance of these things if the *present Church* be not Infallible. And if we can have no assurance of them, what *obligation* can lye upon us to believe them? for, *assurance* of the *matters* of *fact* which are the *foundations* of *Faith*, is necessary in order to the obligation to believe; I mean such an assurance as matters of fact are capable of; for no higher can be required than the nature of things will bear. And what a strange assertion then is this, that *matters of fact* cannot be conveyed to us in an unquestionable manner, unless the present *Church* stamp her Infallibility upon them? Cannot we have an unquestionable assurance that there were such persons as *Cæsar* and *Pompey*, and that they did such and such things without some infallible testimony? If we may in such things, why not in other *matters of fact* which infinitely more concern the world to know than whatever *Cæsar* or *Pompey* did? But this will be more at large examined afterwards; I only now take notice of the consequence of this principle, and how fairly it destroys all *rational evidence* of the truth of our Religion; which whosoever takes away will be by force of reason, a *Sceptick* in the first place, and an *Infidel* in the second. Neither is the danger meerly in destroying the rational evidence of Religion; but, 2. In putting the whole weight of Religion upon the proofs of the *present Churches* infallibility, which whosoever considers how silly and weak they are, cannot sufficiently wonder at the design of those men, who put the *most excellent Religion* in the world, and which is built upon the highest and truest *reason*, to such a strange kind of *Ordeal tryal*, that if she pass not through this St. *Winifreds needle*, her innocency must be suspected, and her truth condemned. So that whosoever questions the truth of this kind of *Purgation*, will have a greater suspicion of a juggle and *imposture* if she be acquitted, than if she had never submitted to such a tryal. And when we come to examine the proofs brought for this *Infallibility*, it will then further appear, what *uncertainty* in *Religion* men are betrayed to, under this confident pretext of *Infallibility*. Thus we see what *Scepticism* in Religion the principles owned upon the account of Infallibility, do bring men to.

§. 9. 3. When you have brought men to this, that the only sure ground of Faith is the *Infallibility of your Church*, you are not able to give them any satisfactory account at all concerning it; but plunge them into greater *uncertainties* than ever they were in before. For you can neither satisfie them what that *Church* is which you suppose *Infallible*, what in that *Church* is the proper *subject* of this *Infallibility*, what *kind* of *Infallibility* this is, nor how we should *know* when the *Church* doth decide *Infallibly* and when not; and yet every one of these questions is no less than absolutely necessary to be resolved,

resolved, in order to the satisfaction of mens minds, as to the *foundation of their Faith.*

1. You cannot satisfie men what that *Church is which you suppose to be Infallible.* Certainly, if you had a design to give men a certain foundation for their *Faith*, you would not be so *shy* of discovering what it is you understand by that *Church* which you would have *Infallible*; if you had meant *honestly*, the first thing you should have done was to have prevented all mistakes concerning the meaning of the *Church*, when you know what various significations it hath, not only in *Scripture*, but among your *selves*. Whether you mean the *Church essential*, *representative*, or *vertual*, for every one of these upon occasion you make use of: and it was never more necessary to have explained them than in this place, and yet you with wonderful care and industry avoid any intimation of what you mean by that *Church* which you would prove Infallible. When you plead so earnestly for the *Churches Infallibility*, I pray tell us what you mean by the *Church*; do you intend the truly *Catholick* and *Universal Church* which comprehends in it all such as own and profess the *Doctrine of Christ*, in which sense it was well said by *Abulensis*, *Ecclesia universalis nunquam errat, quia nunquam tota errat, The universal Church never errs, because the whole Church is never deceived.* Or, do you mean by your *Catholick Church* some particular *part* of it, to which you apply the name of *Catholick* not for *Universality* of extent, but *soundness of Doctrine*? then it will be necessary yet further, to shew what part of the *Church* that is, by what *right* and *title* that hath *engrossed* the name of *Catholick*, so as to exclude other Societies of *Christians* from it; and whether you must not first prove the absolute integrity and soundness of her Doctrine, before you can attribute this title to it. For otherwise you will find that marvellously true, which the same *Tostatus* saith, *Ecclesia Latinorum non est Ecclesia Universalis sed quædam pars ejus: ideò etiamsi tota ipsa erraſſet, non errabat Ecclesia Universalis, quia manet Ecclesia Universalis in partibus illis quæ non errant, sive illæ sint numero plures quàm errantes, sive non.* So that if you prove the Infallibility of the *Catholick Church*, this proves nothing at all as to the *Roman Church*, which at most can be supposed to be but a *part* of it, and though that should err, the *Catholick Church* might not err, because that remains in those parts which *err not*, though they be more or less in number than those that err. This is the sense of his words; who seemed to have a much truer conception of the *Universal Church*, than those now of your *Sect* and *Party*. If then we may believe the *Church* to be *infallible*, and yet, in the mean time, condemn your *Church* for the grossest *Errours*: Will it not be found necessary for you, to tell us yet more distinctly, What you mean by the *Church* you would prove Infallible? But, supposing that only those parts you esteem *Catholick*, make up the *Catholick Church*, even among them the Question will still return, What you mean by this *Catholick Church*? Do you mean all the *Individual Persons* in this number, taken either *distributively* or *collectively*? or, Do you mean, *all those* who are entrusted with the Government of these? And then, Whether all *Inferiour Pastors*, or only *Bishops*? And if *Bishops*, Whether all these *collectively*, or else by way of *Representation in a Council*? and still remember to make it good, that what you pitch upon as the acception of the *Church*, be not an effect of humane Policy, as *Albertus Pighius* said, *All Councils were no more*; but that what you fasten the acception of the *Church-Catholick* upon, you be sure to make it out, that is the *Catholick Church* to whom the *Promises* are made in *Scripture*: And, be sure to tell us, How a *Church* comes to be infallible by *Representation*? Whether as they, who make the *Church representative*, deliver the sense of the *Church* they *represent*; or by an immediate *Promise* made to them upon their Convention.

Præfat. in Mat. quæst. 13.

Quæst. 4. *in Matth. ad prolog.* 2.

vention. If the former, Whether it will not be necessary, in order to the *Infallibility* of the *Council*, to know, that it speaks the sense of all those particular *Churches* whom they represent: If the latter, you must remember such *places* as belong to them, as representing the *Church*; for otherwise any company of *Christians* assembled together, will challenge an equal interest in them; and then you will find it a hard matter to prove one *infallible*, and not the other. But, if after all this, your *Windmill* should dwindle into a *Nutcracker*, and this *harrangue* concerning the *Infallibility* of the *Catholick Church*, should at last end in one *particular Person*; which by a strange *Catachresis*, must be call'd the *Church*, or else, as *Heir* at *Law* to her, doth take possession of all her priviledges. Then the *Testament* must be produced wherein he is named so, and those clauses especially, wherein the rights and priviledges of *her* are devolved over to *him* and *his Heirs for ever*. There being then so much ambiguity and uncertainty in the very name of the *Church-Catholick*, which you would prove infallible, that if nothing else discovered your *Imposture*, yet this would sufficiently, that you would undertake to resolve *Mens Faith by the Infallibility of the Church*, and yet never offer to shew what that *Church* is.

2. Supposing you had shewn what the *Church* is, yet you never tell us what the *subject of Infallibility is in that Church*. For, when in this case you speak of *Infallibility*, you must remember you are not to shew what that *Church* is, which is not deceived in judging concerning things necessary to Salvation, but what that *Church* is, which is infallible in her *Direction* of others to Salvation: For, you speak of such an Infallibility as must be a *Guide* to others, and whose infallible *judgement* must be known to all such who must *resolve their Faith into her Testimony*: You would have done then no more than was absolutely necessary to have precisely shewn us where this infallibility is lodged in your *Church*; whether in *Pope* or *Council*, or both together. I suppose it can be no news either to you, or to the Reader, what *Controversies* there are among the greatest of your side, whether the *Pope* or *Council* be the *greater*, and to whom this *Infallibility* belongs; neither are either side fully agreed in their own way, for some that are for the *Infallibility* of a general *Council*, will make that *infallible* without the *Pope*, others account that opinion, if not *heretical*, the *next step* to it. Those who are for the *Pope's Infallibility*, are not agreed neither when he shall be said to be *infallible*: They who speak *Oracles* tell us, when he doth define *ex Cathedrâ*, but what that is, neither they nor we can well tell; so he say it is, when he hatha *Congregation of chosen Cardinals* about him, others make the *whole Colledge of Cardinals* necessary, and therefore some in the late Definition concerning the *Jansenists* were refractory, because it was defined only by a *Congregation of chosen Cardinals*, which they said, was not defining *ex Cathedrâ*: some again make neither of these necessary, but suppose the Infallibility lodged in the *Pope* himself. And are we not at a fine *pass* for the certainty of our Faith, if it must rely upon the infallible Testimony of your *Church*; and yet you your selves not at all agreed to whom this *Infallible Testimony* doth belong? Think not that we will be put off with that silly evasion, *That these differences among you hinder not the certainty of Faith, because it is not* de fide *either way*. For 1. How shall we come to know among you what is *de fide*, and what not, till you are agreed to whom this *Infallibility* belongs? And if it belongs to a *general Council*, then it is *de fide*; for it was determined at the *Council* of *Basil*, in behalf of the *Council*, and therefore if one of the opinions be true, it must be *de fide*; for, I suppose you make that to be so, which is determined by the infallible Testimony of your *Church*. 2. How shall a man believe, that any thing at all is *de fide* among you, if that on which your *Faith* is to rest, be not *de fide*? For,

ſuppoſing a difference to happen, which hath often done between the *Pope* and *Council*, and they decree contrary things to each other, if it be not *de fide*, to believe either the one or the other diſtinctly to be infallible, upon what Teſtimony at ſuch a time muſt that which ſuppoſeth the infallible *Teſtimony* of *your Church* rely? 3. If it be ſaid not to be *de fide*, becauſe not determined; by the ſame reaſon your *Churches Infallibility* cannot be *de fide*, becauſe not determined neither: For, if the Determination of the *Church* be neceſſary to make any thing *de fide*, it muſt by the ſame reaſon be neceſſary to make your *Churches Infallibility de fide*; and, I ſuppoſe, you will not readily inſtance in any decree of the *Catholick Church*, where the Teſtimony of your *Church* is determined to be *infallible*. And yet one would imagine, that if there were ſuch a neceſſity in order to *Faith*, of the *Infallible Teſtimony* of your *Church*, there would be an equal neceſſity of believing this *Infallibility* on the ſame Teſtimony: or if one may believe one Article eſpecially ſo important a one as that, without any precedent *infallible Teſtimony*, why not any other, nay, why not all the reſt? Thus you ſtill ſee, how *uncertainties* grow upon us, when we ſearch into your account of Faith.

p. 55 n. 1. 3. You are not certain neither, *What kind of Infallibility this is*; For you offer to prove the Church *infallible*, by the ſame way that *Moſes*, *Chriſt*, *and his Apoſtles were proved infallible*: A very fair Offer, if you could make it good; but then we were in hopes you would have proved ſuch a *kind of Infallibility* as they had; you tell us, *No*: for your Infallibility is *Supernatural*, but *not Divine*; that it is *preciſe Infallibility*, but *not abſolute*; that it is not by *immediate Revelation*, but by *immediate Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*: Something you would have, but you cannot tell what; an *Infallibility* in the *Concluſion*, without any in the *Uſe* of *means*; an Infallibility by *immediate Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*, yet but in a *ſort Divine*; an Infallibility yielding nothing to *Scripture* in point of *Supernaturality* and *Certainty*, yet nothing ſo *infallible* as *Scripture*. Are not theſe brave things to make wiſe men certain in their Religion with! that they are to believe the *Scriptures* upon a Teſtimony *infallible*, yet not *infallible*; *divine*, yet not *divine*; and therefore *certain*, but not *certain*; *true*, but not *true*. But of the ſillineſs of theſe Diſtinctions, afterwards. But, can you think to perſwade wiſe or rational men to believe their *Religion* on ſuch terms as theſe are? Had they no other evidence than what you give them, would they not be ſhrewdly tempted to reject all Religion, as a meer *Impoſture*, as no doubt your Doctrine of *Infallibility* is? A ſtrange kind of *Taliſman*, which ſecures your *Pope* from a poſſibility of erring, but ſtill he muſt be under the *certain direction of his Stars*; for, if he be not *in Cathedrâ*, this *Teleſm* doth him no good at all. It were heartily to be wiſhed, if he ſhould once happen to be *in Cathedrâ*, he would infallibly determine what it was to be *in Cathedrâ* for ever after; for it would eaſe mens minds of a great many troubleſome ſcruples, which they cannot, without ſome infallible Determination, get themſelves quit of. But ſtill *we are bound to believe your Church Infallible*: But, I pray, whence comes this Infallibility? *Comes it from Heaven, or is it of Men? From Heaven*, no doubt, you ſay; for it *is by a promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt*. This were ſomething, if it were proved; but yet you maintain this *Infallibility* in ſuch a manner, that none who read the *Scriptures* could ever think, it were promiſed there. For there they always read, *That the Spirit of Truth is a Spirit of Holineſs, and never dwells in thoſe who are carnal or wicked men*; but, you tell us, That let the lives of *Popes* be what they will; they have no *promiſe* to ſecure them from being *wicked*, but the *Spirit of God* doth by *immediate Aſſiſtance* ſecure them from being *fallible*. But, I pray, Which of theſe two is not only more contrary to

Scripture,

p. 58. n. 4.

Scripture, but to *Humane Nature*; *Wickedness* or *Fallibility*? This latter, so consequent upon the imperfection of our understandings, that, till we put off the one, we can hardly be freed from the other; but *Wickedness* is that which the whole design of *Christian Religion* is against, and administers the highest *Motives*, and the greatest *Assistance* for the conquest of; and can it then be thought suitable to such a *Doctrine*, that the *Divine Spirit* should, like *Mahomet's Dove*, be always ready to *whisper* in the ear of the most *profligate person*, if it be but his fortune to sit *in Cathedrâ*? Such a kind of *Infallibility* as this, I assure you, will never prevail with any such persons, who understand *Christian Religion*, to believe the *Doctrine* of it upon such pretences as yours are.

4. Supposing, you could tell men intelligibly and suitably to the Doctrine of *Christianity*, What *kind of Infallibility this is*; yet if you cannot satisfie them, *When your Church doth define infallibly*, you leave them still in the same *Labyrinth*, without any clue to direct them out of it. But, if we consider what things are necessary to be believed, before we can believe any definition of your *Church infallible*, how impossible it is to be *infallibly assured* of any such definition of your *Church*, sure you cannot blame us for crying out of the *Labyrinth* you have brought us into. §. 10.

1. How many things in *Christian Religion* are to be believed, before we can imagine any such thing as an *infallible Testimony of your Church*? And if the *Infallibility* of that be the *ground* of *Faith*, on what account must those things be *believed*, which are antecedent to the belief of such an *infallible Testimony*? Now, that many things, and some of them far from being clear, are to be believed antecedently to an *infallible Testimony*, will appear; if we do but consider what they commonly mean by that *Church*, which they suppose *infallible*, and what must be supposed, that this *Infallibility* be the *Rule* of Faith. By the *Church*, they tell you, they mean the *Catholick Church*: but lest you should think them too honest in saying so, at next word it is, the *Roman-Catholick Church* (just as if one should say the *German-Universal Emperour*.) But lest you should think at least they meant the *Roman Church of all Ages*, and think you might have some relief from the *Primitive Roman Church*, they will soon rectifie your mistakes, by telling you, it is the *present Roman-Church* they mean; but if it be the *present Roman-Church*, it may be you would be willing to hear the judgement of *all the honest men in that Church*, and that you hope many of the people and learned men (not in *Orders*) may speak their minds freely. To prevent that, they tell you they mean only *the representative Church*. But still the *Bishops*, who make up this *representative Church*, may in their several *Synods* complain of abuses, and rectifie miscarriages; therefore they understand not *Bishops by themselves*, or *particular Synods*, but met together in *General Councils*. But yet, if the *Councils* were truly *Oecumenical*, there might be some hopes of redress. But for that they are sure; for they allow none to be members of the *General Councils*, which are in *Schism* or *Heresie*; and their own *Church* is to be Judge, what *Schism* and *Heresie* is; and they are hugely to blame then, if they admit any but those of their own party. But yet, some *Councils* have stood upon their priviledges in opposition to the *Pope*, as those of *Constance* and *Basil*. Therefore, to make all sure, no *Council* is lawful in it self, or its decrees bind the *Church*, but such as is *call'd* and *confirmed by the Pope*: who is strangely to blame then, if he suffers any thing to pass to his own prejudice: So that this *Infallibility* of the *Pope*, is the *last resort* in the *resolution of Faith*; for all the rest, we see, are uncertain. And what a vast measure of *Faith* (greater than that which our *Saviour* said, would remove mountains) is necessary to *believe* this *Infallibility* of the *Pope*? for in the first place, unless he believes the particular *Roman-Church* to be the

Catholick Church, he ſpoils all the *Conjuring* afterwards, with not having *Faith* enough *about him*. Again, he muſt *believe*, that *Chriſt* hath promiſed an *Infallible Aſſiſtance to the Paſtors of the Church as diſtinct from the People*; but this avails little ſtill, unleſs he believes theſe *Credentials* muſt not be opened, but in *full Council*; and that *Council* ſuch a one as the *Pope* calls, and in which *himſelf preſides*, either in *Perſon*, or by his *Legates*, and that the *Decrees* of the *Council* oblige not the *Church*, without the *Pope's Confirmation*; and to that end you muſt believe, that S. *Peter* was made *Monarch of the Church by Chriſt*; that this *Monarchy* was to be derived to all his *Succeſſors* in all places; but as to this (where-ever he was beſides) he never had any Succeſſor any where but at *Rome*: And theſe Succeſſors of his at *Rome*, cannot for their *lives* err, if they do but ſit *in Cathedra*. Certainly he that hath *Faith* to ſwallow all theſe things, is hugely to blame if he *ſtick* at any thing; and by that time a man's underſtanding is *debauched* ſufficiently by theſe Principles, I make no queſtion but ſuch a one will believe *Infallibility*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, or any thing in the world. But beſide theſe things, in order to the making the *Churches Teſtimony the Rule of Faith* to any one, there muſt another *doſe* of *Principles* be taken, which have *Opium* enough in them to lay *aſleep* all the remainders of reaſon: For he muſt infallibly believe the *Church* to be *infallible*, though no *infallible Argument* be brought for the proof of it; That this *Church* doth judicially and authoritatively *pronounce* her *Sentence* in matters of Faith, though we know not what that *Church* is, which muſt ſo pronounce; That he infallibly know that this particular *Sentence* was *ſo pronounced*, though he can have no other than *Moral Means* of knowing it; And laſtly, That the *Infallibility* muſt be the firſt *thing believed*, although all *theſe things* muſt of neceſſity be *believed* before it. And if after this *ſecond Purgation*, he be not a true *Son* of the *Church* of *Rome*, he deſerves to be *Anathematized* as an obſtinate perſon, for having any thing of *reaſon* in him. Therefore I wonder not that the Doctrine of *Infallibility* ſeems no ſtrange thing to you; for a man muſt devour ſuch *Giant-like Abſurdities*, before he comes to it, that when he comes at it, he finds it *nothing*. But ſtill, one would think it a little ſtrange, that this *Infallibility* ſhould be the only *Foundation* of believing all things in *Religion*; and yet *ſo many things*, and ſome of them very *ſtrange ones*, muſt of neceſſity be certainly believed before it.

2. Suppoſing a man not only believes all theſe things before it, but doth *really believe your Church infallible*, yet he is *uncertain* ſtill how he ſhould know *When your Church defines infallibly*. For ſo many things are required in reference to the *Perſon defining*, ſo many for the *definition it ſelf*, that it will be no eaſie matter to remove thoſe difficulties which lye in the way of his Aſſent to ſuch a Definition. As to the *Perſon*, if he be not a *Chriſtian*, if he be not a *Prieſt*, if not a *Lawful Pope*, all his *Definitions* are far from being *infallible*; yet none of all theſe can any one be aſſured of according to your Principles of *the intention of the Prieſt being neceſſary in the adminiſtration of Sacraments, in order to the effect of them.* (But the large train of Conſequences following from hence, I forbear to urge you with, becauſe they have been ſo often urged by *abler Pens.*) But, What will you ſay, when we are ſo far from aſſurance, as to the *Pope*'s being *legally choſen*, that we have, if not *great Evidence*, yet very *high Preſumptions* of the contrary, what becomes then of your *Pope*'s Infallibility? Nay, from the *illegality* of one, follows the *illegality* of all his Succeſſors, becauſe they were choſen by *Cardinals*, made by him; who could be no lawful *Cardinals*, becauſe he was no *legal Pope*, and conſequently not they who were made by them. The caſe is this; There is a *Bull* of *Pope Julius the ſecond*, againſt the *Simoniacal Election* of any *Pope*, which the *Cardinals*, upon their firſt entrance

into

into the *Conclave*, ſwear ſolemnly to obſerve. In which *Bull* it is expreſly ſaid, That *if any Pope be Simoniacally choſen by any of the Cardinals, upon any gift or promiſe whatſoever, that ſuch an Election is* ipſo facto *null; and the Cardinals may oppoſe one ſo choſen, as if guilty of manifeſt Hereſie; and that none ought to receive or look on ſuch a one as Pope; neither can this Simoniacal Election be made good by inthroniſation, courſe of time, ſubmiſſion of Cardinals*, &c. *And that they ought all to avoid him as a Magician, Heathen, Publican, or the Founder of Hereſie.* This is the ſubſtance of that *Bull*. Now it is notoriouſly known, that *Sixtus the fifth*, was *Simoniacally choſen Pope*. For, that he might be choſen, he did under his hand promiſe to *Cardinal d' Eſte*, who had a great intereſt in the *Conclave*, that in the time of his *Popedome*, he would never create *Jerome Matthew*, the *Cardinals* great enemy, a *Cardinal*: upon which promiſe he was through his intereſt choſen *Pope*. But, when afterwards the *Pope* violated his *Faith* to him, by creating his enemy *Cardinal*; *d' Eſte*, being highly incenſed againſt him for it, ſent the very Inſtrument ſubſcribed by the *Pope*'s own hand, to *Philip the ſecond King of* Spain, who in the year 1589. ſent the *Duke of Suiſſe* extraordinary *Embaſſadour* to *Rome*, to intimate to *Sixtus the fifth*, his intention of calling a *General Council*, according to the *Bull of Julius the ſecond*, for declaring this *Simoniacal Election*. When this Meſſage was delivered to the *Pope*, and he ſaw the Inſtrument was diſcovered under his own hand, he fell into ſuch a perplexity, that he dyed ſoon after, which ſtopt the progreſs of the *buſineſs*. By this it evidently appears, that *Sixtus* himſelf was no lawful *Pope*, and therefore could create no *Cardinals*: and, becauſe the *Cardinals* created by him, had a voice in the Election of the ſubſequent *Popes*; it follows, That there hath been no legal *Pope* ſince *Sixtus the fifth*. For, after the death of *Sixtus*, *Cardinal Montalto* his *Nephew*, with *forty Votes* entred the *Conclave*, and choſe *Urban the ſeventh*, who lived but few days; after him *Gregory the fourteenth*, who was *Pope* but ten months: after him *Innocentius the ninth*, who continued but two months; after him *Clement the eighth*, who out-lived the Election *thirteen years*. But not to enquire any further into the irregular Election, and the *Simoniacal bargains* of *Paul the fifth*, after the death of *Clement*; this certainly may ſuffice to let men ſee, what becomes of their *Faith*, when they pin it upon the *Pope's ſleeve*: For, if we are to rely upon his infallible Teſtimony, and he ſo far from being *infallible*, that by their own *Conſtitutions* he was no *Pope*, nor to be looked on as other than a *Magician*, *Heathen*, and *Heretick*, is not our Faith then ſetled on a ſure *Foundation*? For what aſſurance can any one have, that amidſt all the enormities, and ſecret *practices* of the *Conclave*, any one is freely and legally choſen? but, Where will his *Faith* ſtand, when it is notorious, that a *Cardinal* muſt ſay, *Dabo tibi claves*, and that not without a *Contract* too? But, ſuppoſe all the aſſurance that may be of the perſon who is to deliver this *infallible Teſtimony*; yet at the utmoſt, the moſt men in the world can have no more than a *Moral Certainty* of the *Definition it ſelf*. If we can imagine, that any one ſhould know that great myſtery, when the *Pope ſhould define ex Cathedrâ*; yet, can he have any greater evidence of ſuch a Definition, than we have concerning the things revealed in Scripture? I cannot think that you will ſuppoſe any greater evidence of it, than if one *ſees and hears it*; and, what do we deſire leſs in reference to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*? But how few in the world are there, who ſtand by, when the *Pope* defines? May others be certain of ſuch a *Definition* or no, ſo as to be obliged to believe it? If not, What good can this *Infallibility* do them? if they may, Why do you quarrel with our way as *uncertain*? when if you grant your *Infallibility*, you cannot preſcribe any more *certain way*, but one much more liable to queſtion and diſpute than ours is: Thus you ſee what little advantage you get by all theſe *bravado's* about

V. Supplicat. ad Imperat. Reg. Princip. ſuper cauſis generalis Concilii convocandi contra Paulum 5. Lond. 1613.

about *Infallibility*; and that you are ſo far from giving a ſatisfactory *account of Faith*, that you expoſe *Chriſtian Religion* to more *doubts*, *ſcruples*, and *uncertainties*, than ever before. Which may abundantly ſhew to all unprejudiced minds, the great *unreaſonableneſs* of your way of reſolving Faith, which was the thing to be proved.

§. 11. 2. But, ſuppoſe your way to be never ſo *reaſonable*, yet *if it effect not that it was brought for*, it deſerves little favour from inquiſitive perſons, and that I now come to evince, *viz. That ſuppoſing your Church infallible, and that Infallibility proved by the Motives of Credibility, you do not eſcape the circle objected againſt your way.* And really, whoſoever conſiders your way of management of things, will find, that though you give out *great words*, and pretend to prove the *Churches Infallibility*, *as Moſes and Chriſt's was proved*; yet your eye was all the while on nothing but the *circle*, and thought, if you could get rid of that, you ſhould do well enough with any thing elſe. For, as though this *circle* had ridden you like an *Ephialtes*, you *tumble*, and *groan*, and *toſs* this way and that, and when you think your ſelf free from it, it lits as cloſe upon you as ever. When you come ſo miſerably off with the proofs of your *Churches Infallibility*, you ſatisfie your ſelf with this; *'Tis ſufficient for the preſent to have declared how the Catholicks fall not into a circle, as his Lordſhip here pretends they do.* Though this could not be ſufficient for your deſign, who had promiſed in the page foregoing, to prove at large the *Infallibility* of the *Church*; yet you had done ſomewhat, if you had done this, which, if I much miſtake not, you are as much to ſeek in, as in the proofs of your *Churches Infallibility*. And that I prove by three things, from the *nature of that Faith* whoſe reſolution you promiſe, from *the perſons you prove it to*, from the *nature* of that *Infallibility* which you attempt to prove.

1. From *the nature of that Faith* you are enquiring a reſolution for, which is not that which you call a *Humane Faith*, but a *Divine Faith*. When you go about to prove the *Churches Infallibility*, by the *Motives of Credibility*, is it a *Divine Faith* or no, which may be built on theſe *Motives?* chuſe which part you pleaſe. If it be, then by your own Confeſſion, a *Divine Faith* may be built on *Prudential Motives*; if it be not, then what is all this to the purpoſe? For the Queſtion is not, Whether by any other *kind of Aſſent* you cannot avoid the *circle*; but, Whether in the reſolution of *Divine Faith* you can or no? For, I hope, you deny not, but the *Scriptures* and the *Churches Infallibility* are both to be believed with the *ſame kind of Aſſent*, built upon an *infallible Teſtimony*; in this caſe I then ask, *Why, with a Divine Faith, you believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God?* You anſwer, *Becauſe the Church, which is infallible, delivers them ſo to us.* If I then ask, *Why with a Divine Faith you believe the Churches Infallibility?* Anſwer me if you can, any other way, than *becauſe the Scriptures, which are infallible, ſay ſo.* And thus you ſee, it is only your running away from the *Queſtion*, makes you think your ſelf out of the *circle*, and not any ſatisfactory Anſwer to it. Will you, or dare you ſay, That is an *Aſſent* of the ſame *nature*, which is built on the *Motives of Credibility*, with that which is grounded on an *infallible Teſtimony?* If it be not, bethink your ſelf of a new Anſwer: if it be, bethink your ſelf of a new *Way* to oppoſe us, and not to think it ſufficient to charge us with building *Divine Faith* on *Prudential Motives*, when you do it your ſelf. But, if you ſhould aſſert that to be a *Divine Faith*, which is built on the *Motives* of *Credibility*, you not only contradict your ſelf, but the great Ones of your own party. For your *Becanus* ſaith, *That theſe Motives are the Foundation only of a prudent Aſſent, but not Infallible*; and *Valentia* goes much higher, and tells us, *The Faith grounded on theſe Motives is not divine, or infuſed, but acquiſite, that it is in its nature uncertain and fallible, that*

Becan. ſum. p. 2. Tom. patr. de fide c. 1. q. 2. ſect. 8. Valent. Tom. 1. diſp. 1. q. 1. punct. 1. ſect. 8. Colum. 35.

that it cannot be the Foundation of Christian Faith. If this be true, To what end do you go about to resolve Faith upon such *uncertainties*, in hopes to escape the *circle* you see others in? Thus you see, how insufficient your attempt is, because you speak not of the same *kind of Assent* as to the *Scripture*, and the *Church*.

2. You avoid not the *Circle* by the *different considerations of the persons* you offer to prove the *Infallibility of the Church* and *Scripture* to. You tell us, *That when you prove the Infallibility of the Church by Scripture, you make use only of Arguments* ad hominem, *and argue* ex principiis concessis *against Sectaries, who deny the Infallibility of your Church, but admit the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, and therefore you may justly use Scripture-arguments against them.* I grant it: but still I say, you avoid not the *Circle* by this *subterfuge* neither. For, 1. The question is not, Which way you will prove the *Infallibility of the Church* against those who deny it; but which way you resolve your *own faith* of the *Churches* Infallibility? therefore this signifies nothing at all as to your *Question* about the *resolution* of *Faith*; for I suppose you build not *that* on any thing which your adversary *grants* or *denys*. Is there no difference between the way of proving a thing to an adversary, and the resolving *ones own Faith?* I question not, but you may dispute with him upon *Principles* he grants and you deny; but, I should think you no wise man to build *your Faith* upon such *Principles*. So that this evasion comes not near the business. 2. Even in disputing against your *Adversaries* you cannot avoid the *circle*, which I thus prove. You offer to prove to them the *Church* to be *Infallible* out of *Scripture*; for this you bring them particular places, and think presently to vanquish them with, *Super hanc Petram, Pasce oves, & Dabo tibi claves*; but hence ariseth another Question, How you come infallibly to know, that this is *the sense* of those places? You know, your *Adversaries* presently deny any such as *Infallibility* to be proved out of them. And, what way have you to assure them, this is the *sense* of them, but because your *Church*, which is *infallible*, delivers this to be the sense of them? And is not this then a plain *circle? You are to believe the Church infallible, because the Scripture saith so; and you are to believe the Scripture saith so, because the Church is infallible.* If this be not still a plain *circle*, you may question whether there be any such figure in *Mathematicks*. P. 55 n. i.

3. I prove you cannot avoid the *Circle* from your own Confession of the *nature of that Infallibility, which you say is in the Church.* For you tell us, *That the Churches Testimony doth not suppose any new Revelation from God, but only a supernatural Assistance of the Holy Ghost, preserving her from all errour in defining the Points of Christian Faith.* By this assertion, you destroy all possibility of avoiding the *Circle by the Motives of Credibility*; for if these had proved an *immediate Divine Revelation in the Church*, I confess you had proved the *Churches Infallibility* independently on *Scripture*; but, when you offer to prove only a *Divine Assistance* with the *Church*, in delivering former *Revelations*, you cannot, and the reason is, because you can bring no ground at all why such an *Assistance* should be necessary in the *Church*; or why it should be expected but from the *Promises made in Scripture* concerning such an *Assistance of God's Spirit* to be with the *Church*: and therefore the utmost your *Motives of Credibility* can pretend to, is only to notifie that *Church* from others, which you suppose *infallible*: but still the *formal reason* of your believing this *Infallibility*, cannot be from those *Motives*, but upon those *Promises* which you suppose to import such an *Assistance of the Holy Ghost* with the *Church*, which shall secure her from errour: So that still the *Circle* returns upon you: For, *you believe the Scriptures infallible, because of the Churches Testimony; and you believe the Church infallible,* P. 58. n. 4.

fallible, becauſe of the Promiſes in Scripture concerning the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt with the Church, ſo as to ſecure her from all errour. And thus, I hope, I have made good this *general Attempt* upon your *way of reſolving Faith*, by manifeſting the great *unreaſonableneſs*, and manifeſt *inſufficiency* of it.

§. 12. I now come to handle the particulars of this Chapter, which conſiſts of two things, *Proofs* and *Evaſions*, the *Proofs* you produce for your *Churches Infallibility*, and your *Evaſions* as to thoſe *Arguments* which are objected by his Lordſhip. Both of theſe will deſerve our *Conſideration*; and if it appear, that your *Proofs* are *weak*, and your *Evaſions ſilly*, you will have no great cauſe to triumph in this *Attempt* of yours. As to your *Proofs*, two things are conſiderable, *your Method of proving*, and the *Proofs themſelves*.

P. 55. n. 1. I begin with the *firſt*, which you deliver in theſe words. *Wherefore, as to the laſt demand (in which only there is difficulty)* viz. *How we know the Church to be infallibly governed by the Holy Ghoſt; we anſwer, that we prove it firſt in general, not by the Scripture, but by the Motives of Credibility, which belong to the Church, in the ſame manner as the Infallibility of* Moſes, *and other Prophets, of Chriſt and his Apoſtles was proved, which was by the Miracles they wrought, and by other ſigns of an Infallible Spirit, direction, and guidance from God, which appeared in them. Whence it is clear, that we incur no circle.* That, *ſuppoſing all that true* which you ſaid before, yet thereby you avoid not the *circle*, I ſhall take it for granted, I have already proved, till you better inform me: Our buſineſs now therefore is, to conſider, which *way* you prove this *Infallibility* of your *Church*, which you tell us, *is not by Scripture* (for which I commend your ingenuity) but by the *Motives of Credibility*. But, leſt any ſhould think this a weak way of probation, you tell us, *It is in the ſame manner that the Infallibility of all perſons divinely inſpired was proved*, not excepting *Chriſt himſelf*. A moſt heroical and generous Attempt! For which the *Church* of *Rome* is infinitely obliged to you, if you make it good: For then it neceſſarily follows, that there is as great danger in not believing the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, as in not believing *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*. For, where there is an *equal obligation* to believe, there is an *equal ſin* in not believing; and where the ſin is equal, it ſtands to reaſon that the *puniſhment* ſhould be ſo too. I ſuppoſe you deny not, but, Where there are *equal Motives* inducing to believe, there reſults an *equal Obligation* to Faith, becauſe the *Grounds* obliging to aſſent, can be no other than the *Motives inducing* to it; and if theſe *Motives* be as ſtrong and evident for your *Churches Infallibility*, as for that of *Moſes* and *Chriſt*, men muſt be as much obliged now to believe your *Church infallible*, as, that *Moſes and Chriſt were ſo*. So that the denial of your *Churches Infallibility*, muſt needs be accounted by you to be as high a piece of *Infidelity*, as if one ſhould call in queſtion the *Infallibility* of *Chriſt* himſelf, For you aſſert, That you have the ſame *Proofs* for the Infallibility of your *Church*, which there were to prove him infallible. I do not therefore wonder at your ſharpneſs and ſeverity in your cenſures of all out of your *Church*, when upon your Principles, the denying your *Churches Infallibility*, muſt needs be an offence of as high a nature, as if one denied the *Infallibility* of the *Sacred Scriptures*. But, leſt you ſhould not think theſe any *Abſurdities* at all, we muſt come yet cloſer to the examination of your *Proofs*: For which we muſt enquire into theſe two things. 1. Whether *the ſame Motives of Credibility belong to your Church, by which* Moſes *and the Prophets, Chriſt and his Apoſtles, ſhewed their Teſtimony to be infallible.* 2. Whether, on ſuppoſition you had the ſame *Motives*, there were the ſame reaſon to believe the Teſtimony of your *Church*, *Infallible*, as there was to believe them to be ſo.

1. Whe-

1. Whether *the same Motives of Credibility belong to your Church or no.* And here again, these things offer themselves to consideration. 1. By what means their *Testimony* was proved *infallible.* 2. Whether your *Churches Testimony* can be proved by the *same Motives* or no. For the *first,* you are pleased to give us this account, *Why* Moses *was accounted infallible; for the Israelites seeing* Moses *to be a person very devout, mild, charitable, and chaste, and endowed with the gift of working miracles, were upon that ground obliged to receive him for a true Prophet; and to believe him infallible, by acknowledging as true and certain, whatever he proposed to them from God.* All which I acknowledge to be very true; but am much to seek, how you will apply it to the proving your *Churches Infallibility.* What kind of *Miracles* those are which your *Church* pretends to, will be examined afterwards; the other *Motives of Credibility* mentioned, are *Devotion, Mildness, Charity,* and *Chastity*; and these, I suppose, you look on as those *Motives,* which must induce men to believe the *Infallibility of your Church.* But, do you really think, that every person who is *devout, mild, charitable,* and *chaste,* is therefore *infallible*? If not, to what purpose do you produce them here? if you do, some out of *your Church* may be as *infallible* as those in it. Especially, if your *superstitious Ceremonies* be the greatest part of your *devotion*; and your *burning of Hereticks,* the Argument of your *mildness*; and your *damning all out of your Church,* be the best evidence of your *Charity*; and the *lives of your Popes,* the most *pregnant Instances* of your *Churches Chastity.* The rest of your discourse, wherein you endeavour after your way, to *prove that there were sufficient Motives of Credibility, to believe the Testimony of Christ and his Apostles,* I suppose no Christian will deny; and *that the Miracles wrought by them, were Proofs that their Testimony was infallible,* I am so far from questioning, that all your other *Motives* signifie nothing without them. Which, because it hath so great an influence on the present dispute, I think it necessary to be a little further cleared, than it is by you, and chiefly for this *end,* to let you see, *how much you have befooled your self in attempting to prove the Infallibility of your Church, in the same manner that Christ and his Apostles Infallibility was proved in,* and yet insisting on that of *Miracles,* as the great evidence of their *Infallibility,* which your *Church* cannot with any face pretend to. I acknowledge it then as a great *Truth,* that it was necessary, that the *Testimony* of all such who pretend to be *infallible,* must be confirmed by such *Miracles,* as *Christ* and his *Apostles* wrought; Nay, that it is impossible, without such *Evidence,* to prove any Testimony infallible, where that *Infallibility* is pretended to, *independently upon Scripture,* as it is in your present case. Which will be thus made evident: *Absolute Infallibility* is not consistent with the *shortness* of the *Humane Understanding,* for such an *Infallibility* must suppose an *infinity* of *Knowledge*; for, where there is a *defect* in the *Apprehension,* there is a *possibility* of *deception*; therefore only an *Infinite Being* can be *absolutely infallible.* Now, man's *Understanding* being so *finite,* and limited in its Conceptions, it is on that account apt to be imposed upon, and to form *false Notions* of things; so that supposing no Being in the world of greater *Perfections* than *man* is, there never could be any such thing as *Infallibility* among men. For, though some mens *Understandings* might *outstrip* others in the quickness of Conception, and solidity of Judgement; yet the *Nature* of *Man* being thus *finite,* that presumption would lye against all pretence of Infallibility. It being then impossible, that mans understanding should be *in it self infallible,* we must consider, whether there be a *possibility* it should receive any *Infallibility* from that *Infinite Being,* which is above it. This then must be taken for granted, that as an *Infinite Understanding* cannot be *deceived,* so *Infinite Goodness* cannot *deceive.* And therefore, whatever doth p. 56. n. 2.

immediately proceed from a *Being infinitely Wiſe and Good*, cannot but be *infallibly True*. And there is no repugnancy at all, in the nature of the thing, but that this *Infinite Being* may, in a way certain, but imperceptible by us, communicate to the *Minds* of *Men* ſuch *Notions* of things, which are the effects of his own *Wiſdom* and *Counſel*: and this is that we call *Divine Inſpiration*. But then we are ſtill to conſider, That the underſtanding of a *finite Creature*, cannot be any further *infallible*, than as it receives thoſe *Notions* which are imprinted upon it by the *Infinite* and *Supreme Intellect* of the world; and ſuch a perſon is no further *infallible* in what he ſpeaks, than as he delivers to the world thoſe *very Conceptions*, which are thus formed in his mind. And this is that which the *Apoſtle* means when he ſays, That
2 Pet. 1. 21. *Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt*. And ſo far as they were thus moved, ſo far they were Infallible, and no further. But this *Infallibility* being not intended meerly for the ſatisfaction of the *mind* of *him* that hath it, but for the general *good* of the *world*, it is neceſſary that there be ſome way whereby men may come to underſtand who are *infallibly aſſiſted*, and who not. For otherwiſe the world would be more expoſed to *deluſions* under this *pretext* of *Infallibility*; than if there were never any ſuch thing in the world. Either therefore every man muſt be *infallibly aſſured* in his *mind*, that ſuch a perſon is infallible in what he is to deliver, which is a needleſs piece of *Enthuſiaſm*; or elſe ſuch *external Evidences* of it are to be uſed, which may induce all rational and conſiderative perſons to the belief of it. Which is the way that *God* in his *infinite Wiſdom* hath made choice of; by making thoſe very perſons, whoſe underſtandings are thus aſſiſted by him, to be the *Inſtruments* of *doing ſome things above the power of nature*. And nothing can be more reaſonable, than to believe their Teſtimony *True*, who are imployed as ſuch immediate *Inſtruments* of *Divine Power*; and if their Teſtimony be believed True, their *Doctrine* muſt be *Infallible*; for the greateſt part of their *Teſtimony* is this, That they deliver not their *Doctrines* from *themſelves*, but immediately from *God*. And conſequently their *Teſtimony* muſt be owned as *infallible*, in whatever they deliver as from *God*; it being very unreaſonable to think, that *God* would favour ſuch perſons with ſo extraordinary a *Power*, who ſhould falſifie their meſſage, and deceive the world. Thus you ſee, That whatever *Motives of Credibility* you would blind the world with, there can be no *Motive* independent on *Scripture*, which is ſufficient to prove *Infallibility*, but ſuch a power of *working Miracles*, *which* Moſes, *and*
P. 56. n. 2. *the Prophets*, *and Chriſt*, *and his Apoſtles had*, which laſt, as you truly ſay, *received their Commiſſion from Chriſt to preach every where*, *and to confirm their words with ſigns that followed*; *by which ſigns*, *all their hearers were bound to ſubmit themſelves unto them*, *and to acknowledge their words for infallible Oracles of Truth*.

§. 13. Now, What reaſonable man could otherwiſe expect, but that after you had ſo ſolemnly promiſed *to prove the Infallibility of your Church*, *in the very ſame manner that* Moſes, *with other Prophets*, *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*
P. 55. n. 1. *were firſt proved to be infallible*, which are twice your words; and your at
P. 56. n. 2. large ſhewing, *That the main ground why they were believed infallible*, *was*, *becauſe of the Miracles wrought by them*, *whence they needed not the Teſtimony of Scripture*: You ſhould have ſhewed us what kind of parallel *Miracles* are wrought in your *Church*, to prove its *infallibility*. But, inſtead of that, when you come to the purpoſe, you ſhuffle us off, in a moſt ridiculous and impertinent manner: For, you tell us, That *as therefore* Moſes,
P. 57. *our bleſſed Saviour*, *and his Apoſtles*, *were proved infallible by their works*, *ſigns*, *and miracles*, *without Scripture*; *ſo is the Church without help of the ſame ſufficiently proved to be infallible by the Motives of Credibility*. Well, but *what*,

and

and *where* are theſe *Motives of Credibility*? Are they of the ſame kind and nature with the *ſigns* and *miracles* wrought by them or not? If not, How can the way and manner be the ſame, which you promiſed to prove the *Churches Infallibility*? If not, What aſſurance can you give us, that thoſe will prove Infallibility, as well as their *works and miracles*? This ſhould have been demonſtrated, and thoſe *motives* produced to the view of the world, if you had deſigned any other than *jugling* with your Readers. Inſtead of this, you tell us, That *Hereticks, though they have the Scripture, yet being out of the true Church, they do wholly want theſe ſigns of Infallibility: of which, ſee* Bellarmine, *and other Catholick Authors diſcourſing more at large,* de notis Eccleſiæ. *'Tis ſufficient for the preſent, to have declared how Catholicks fall not into a Circle, as his Lordſhip pretends they do.* Theſe are excellent ways of proof, and fit only for a Church that pretends to be infallible, and then moſt of all, when her Infallibility was to be proved. What did you lead us this long dance for, if you never intended to prove your *Church infallible?* Could you not have referred us to *Bellarmine* at firſt, as well as at laſt? Nay, and now you do turn us off to him, you bid us, go ſeek the *Notes of the Church*, and not the *Proofs of Infallibility*; which, ſure, are different things, unleſs you ſuppoſe no *Church True*, but what is *Infallible*. But however, you are ſure not to miſs the *Hereticks*, they muſt have a blow at parting, *They are out of the Church, and do wholly want theſe ſigns of Infallibility.* What *ſigns of Infallibility?* ſpeak out, and tell us, *What they are*, and *where they lie*, and *how they may be known*? for otherwiſe we may miſtake in the *Phyſiognomy* of your *Church*, and inſtead of *ſigns* of *Infallibility*, we may ſee ſhrewd *ſigns* of *impoſture* and *deluſion* in her. And it is the more ſuſpicious, becauſe you are ſo afraid of producing them after ſo ſolemn a promiſe to do it. However, you tell us, *'Tis ſufficient for the preſent to have declared how Catholicks fall not into a Circle:* Well, I ſee, though we miſs of the *Coals S.* Laurence *was broyled on*, we ſhall have a *Feather from the wing of a Seraphim*; Though you fail of your promiſe, we ſhall have ſomething as good; and as great a feat of activity as that had been, *viz.* to let us ſee, *How the Papiſts dance in a round, and yet make no Circle.* Your demonſtrations are ſo good in this kind, it is pity you do not imploy your excellent wit in ſquaring *Mathematical Circles*, as well as *this*; and I ſhall as ſoon hope to ſee you perform the one as the other. But, Can you, without ſmiling at our ſimplicity, tell us, (after ſuch a wide-mouthed promiſe, as you made in the page foregoing; *But, becauſe we have often promiſed to prove the Infallibility of the Church, it will be neceſſary to inſiſt ſomewhat longer upon this Point, and declare the matter at large*) *That it is enough to vindicate your ſelves from the Circle*? Was this the thing you promiſed, or the proofs of your *Churches Infallibility*? I confeſs *Quid ferret hic tanto dignum promiſſor hiatu*? came into my mind at firſt reading thoſe words, and it proves accordingly. You really meant no ſuch thing as proving your *Church infallible*: and you are very excuſable in it, though you had promiſed it; for no *Promiſe can bind to impoſſibilities.* But it may be yet, though theſe *Proofs* do not come after the Promiſe, they may have gone before it; For I find before a large *Catalogue* mentioned of ſuch *ſigns and motives*, which may prove the *Churches Infallibility*, as *ſanctity of life, miracles, efficacy, purity and excellency of doctrine, fulfilling of Prophecies, ſucceſſion of lawfully ſent Paſtors, Unity, Antiquity, and the very name of Catholick*, &c. Number enough, if that would do it. But we ſhall ſee, what force theſe *Motives* are of by theſe following Queries. P. 56. n. 2. P. 55. n. 1.

1. Is it all one with you, *To know a Church to be true, and to make it infallible*? Theſe you call the *Motives of Credibility* for your *Churches Infal-*

libility, were wont to be eſteemed only the *Notes of Diſtinction* of the True *Church* from all others. The Queſtion, I ſuppoſe, concerning *theſe*, had this riſe. There being, after the Reformation, ſeveral diſtinct Societies of men, pretending to be the True *Chriſtian Church*, to which every *Chriſtian* ought to aſſociate himſelf; there was a neceſſity of pitching on ſome way, whereby the True *Chriſtian Church* might be diſtinguiſhed from other Communions; which begat a new Controverſie, What were the proper *Notes* of this Society. Thoſe of your party, as *Bellarmine* tells you, differed much in the number of them: Some of which are thoſe by you mentioned; but whether they be the True *Notes* of the *Church* or no, which hath been largely examined by others, What are theſe to the proof of *Infallibility*, ſetting aſide that of *Miracles*? Is it not poſſible that there ſhould be a Society of Men joyning together in the Profeſſion of *Chriſtian Religion*, but theſe Men muſt preſently be *infallible* in whatever they deliver as the Senſe of their Society? Their viſible Profeſſion of *Chriſtian Religion*, makes them a *True Church*: but cannot men ſeem to profeſs our Religion, unleſs they have a viſible *Infallible Head* to guide them? Is *Infallibility* the *Soul* of a *Church*, which gives it its Being, I mean, a *preſent Infallibility* continually actuating and informing the *Body* of it? Cannot a man be known to be a *True Man*, unleſs he be *inſpired*? Nor a *Church* diſtinguiſhed from other *Societies*, but by a *Spirit* of *Infallibility*? The truth is, Let *Bellarmine* multiply his *fifteen Notes of the Church* to *fifteen hundred*, if he pleaſe; nay, let it pretend to what *Infallibility* it pleaſe: if any Society of men challenging the name of *Church* to it ſelf, do deſtroy the *end* of its *Conſtitution*, or hold any thing directly contrary to the *Foundation* of its *Inſtitution*; all other *Notes* in the world can never make it a *True Church*. So that the only certain *Note* of a True *Church*, is its *Agreement* with the primary *Foundation* of it in that *Doctrine* which was *Infallible*, and atteſted by *Miracles* undoubtedly Divine: That which holds the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, is the *Chriſtian Church*; and the nearer any *Society* comes to *that*, the *purer* it is; the more it is diſtant from it, the more *impure*: and no man who honours the *Chriſtian Religion*, can be bound to communicate with the *Impurities* of ſuch a *Church*, let it bear it never ſo high under the pretence of *infallibility*. If you boaſt never ſo much of your *Unity*, *Succeſſion*, *Antiquity*, the *name of Catholick*, &c. if your *Doctrine* be *repugnant* to what was originally delivered by the Founder of the *Chriſtian Church*; your Society is not the True *Chriſtian Church*. But, ſuppoſe it were, and that it were known ſo to be by ſuch *Notes* as theſe are; Can you not conceive a *Church* ſhould be conſonant to the Doctrine of *Chriſt*, but it muſt be it ſelf *infallible* in *deciding Controverſies*? Cannot you imagine a *Society* conſiſting of all True *Chriſtians* in the world, ſhould be made up of ſuch perſons who all firmly believe that *Doctrine infallible* which *Chriſt* delivered, but yet judge themſelves all fallible, and dare not uſurp that *royal prerogative* of *Heaven*, in preſcribing *infallibly* in matters queſtioned, but leave all to judge according to the *Pandects* of the *Divine Laws*, becauſe each member of this *Society* is bound to take care of his ſoul, and of all things that tend thereto? Is ſuch an *Idea* of a *Chriſtian Church*, a thing unreaſonable, inconſiſtent, or contrary to any *Law* of its Foundation; or rather, is it not a very true and juſt repreſentation of that *Society* of men, which our *bleſſed Saviour* inſtituted as a *Church* in the world?

§. 14. 2. Do you mean, *That theſe Motives ſhould prove the Chriſtian Church at large infallible, or your preſent particular univerſal Church of* Rome? For ſome of your *Motives* ſeem to reſpect the *one*, and the reſt the *other* Notion of it. When you mention *miracles*, *efficacy*, *purity and excellency of Doctrine*, *fulfilling of Prophecies*, do you really intend theſe for the proof of

of your *present Roman-Churches Infallibility*, as that is distinct from all other *Churches* of *Christians* in the world? If you do (as you must, if you speak to the purpose) shew us what *miracles*, *efficacy*, *purity and excellency of Doctrine* there are in your *Church* beyond and beside all other *Churches* in the world: What *fulfilling of Prophecies* among you, which makes your *Church infallible?* Is it the *Prophecy*, That *your Church shall be infallible* that is fulfilled? Shew then to us where *that Prophecy* is, and how it appears to be *fulfilled?* Is it because *your Church pretends to be infallible?* I do heartily acknowledge, *some Prophecies are therein fulfilled*, but such as your *Church* hath little ground to be proud of their accomplishment. But, to all impartial *Christians*, the accomplishment of *those Prophecies*, which speak of the *degenerate state of the Church*, as they are a great Confirmation of the *Infallibility* of the *Divine Revealer* of them, when they see it so remarkably in the *signatures of your Church*; so they are far from being any *motive of credibility* to them to prove your *Church to be Infallible*. Unless it be meant that the *state of your Church is an infallible evidence that those Prophecies are fulfilled*. But I pray, why should *fulfilling of Prophecies*, make your *Church Infallible?* I had rather thought, if you could have proved *your Church to have been Prophetical*, it had been more to your purpose. And if your *Popes in Cathedrâ* had foretold *future events*, which by their coming to pass, had evidenced to the world they had a *true spirit of Prophecie*, then indeed you had said something towards *Infallibility*. But that the *meer fulfilling of Prophecies*, owned Divine by all *Christians*, should prove *your Church Infallible*, is such *a motive of Credibility* concerning that *Infallibility*, that it proves nothing, but by this consequence, *If Christ were Infallible, then your Church is*. Or do you mean, *because some Prophecies concerning your Church are fulfilled, therefore your Church is Infallible*; by the same reason I hope you will not deny, but *that Antichrist is Infallible*, for when ever he did, doth, or shall appear, no doubt there will be *fulfilling of Prophecies*, and those very clear ones too. And therefore *Antichrist* and *your Pope* may go together for *Infallibility*.

But it may be yet you have some *other motives* besides *fulfilling Prophecies*, and those are *miracles*; now you speak indeed to the purpose. But yet still we poor Infidels (*because out of your Church*) desire a little satisfaction concerning them too. 1. We very reasonably desire, *That he in your Church who pretends most to infallibility, should do these miracles himself*. For that was alwayes the *way* in *Scripture*, for them whose *testimony* was to be believed *Infallible*, to be the *workers* of those *miracles* which should induce men to believe such an *Infallibility*. Do you think the *Israelites* would have believed *Moses Infallible*, if any ordinary *Israelite* had wrought those *miracles* which he did? unless you would suppose that those *miracles* were purposely wrought to have attested that *Moses was Infallible*. But yet *God* thought it much more fit, that *Moses himself* should be the *instrument* of doing them, and so it was with our *Blessed Saviour*. Let then your *Church* produce the several *miracles* wrought by your *Popes* to attest their Infallibility; or, if you believe *Pope and Council* the subject of *Infallibility*, produce the *miracles* to prove that. *God* was always so just and reasonable, as not to expect the belief of any *Infallibility* without such evidences given for it as might perswade men to believe it: and you acknowledge, *That independently on Scripture there can be no such proof of Infallibility as Miracles*, and you require it from us to believe the *present Church Infallible*, where then are your *present miracles* wrought to attest this Infallibility? For as long as you require such an assent to the *present Churches Infallibility*, it is necessary on your own grounds, that the *present Church* should always work *miracles* in order to the proving this *Infallibility*.

2. We

2. We deſire *ſuch miracles as may ſufficiently convince the Infidels as to this point of your Infallibility.* For that was always the *way* uſed in *Scripture*; The intention of *miracles* was to perſwade thoſe who did not believe. Would *Pharaoh*, or the *Ægyptians* have believed *Moſes*, if all his *miracles had been wrought in a corner*, where none but *Iſraelites* had been preſent? Would the *Jews* have believed *in Chriſt*, if he had not come in publick among them, and wrought ſuch frequent, publick and uncontrouled miracles, that his greateſt *enemies* durſt not deny them? If you would then have us believe your *preſent Churches Infallibility*, let your *Pope*, or at leaſt your *Prieſts* come and do ſuch kind of *miracles* among us which may bear the examination of inquiſitive men, and then try whether we will not believe your *Infallibility*; but till then, excuſe us. Think not we are of ſuch eaſie Faith, that the pretended growing out of a *Leg* in *Spain*, or any of your famous *miracles* wrought by your *Prieſts* in *Italy*, will perſwade us to believe your *Church Infallible*. It is always obſerved, your *miracles* are moſt talked on, where people are moſt *ignorant*, and therefore moſt apt to be deceived. Your *Prieſts*, like the *Devils* in the *Primitive times*, can do no *feats* when their *oppoſers* are by; It is an eaſie thing for a *Stump* to grow a *Leg* in its paſſage from *Spain* hither; for *Fama creſcit eundo*; ſuch things are moſt believed where *circumſtances* are leaſt capable of examination. And the *juglings* and impoſtures of your *Prieſts* have been ſo notorious in this kind, that their *pretences* to *miracles* have made more *Infidels* than *Catholicks*, by making men more apt to queſtion, whether ever there were any *real miracles* done, than believe the *truth* of yours. Very likely then it is, that you ſhould perſwade the world your *Church is Infallible*, becauſe of the *miracles* wrought in it.

3. What diſcrimination do you put between thoſe *lying wonders* which you are foretold ſhall be wrought at the *coming of Antichriſt*, and thoſe *pretended miracles* which are wrought among you? Convince us by ſufficient evidence, that the things which ſeem moſt confirmed by your *miracles*, viz. *Invocation of Saints*, is a thing conſonant to the doctrine eſtabliſhed by the undoubted *miracles* of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*? If it be contrary to it, either you muſt prove that *doctrine* falſe; or, if you admit it true, you prove your *miracles* to be *falſe*: becauſe contrary to a *doctrine* eſtabliſhed by *miracles* undoubtedly Divine. And God can never be ſuppoſed to atteſt with *miracles* the truth of *doctrines* contrary to each other. And thence the wiſeſt of your *Church* are ſo far from inſiſting on this of *miracles* for a *motive of credibility* concerning your *Churches Infallibility*, that they leave it out from being a *note* of the *Church*; becauſe *Hereticks*, as they ſay, may as to all outward appearance work as great *miracles* as the beſt *Catholicks*. And therefore *Bellarmin* ſaith, *No man can have an abſolute certainty concerning the truth of miracles, becauſe the Devil, though he cannot work true miracles, can work, as to appearance, the greateſt.* Therefore ſince the confirmation of *Chriſtian Religion* by *miracles undoubtedly Divine*, there can be no relyance on the tryal of *miracles* for the *truth* of any *doctrine*: for thoſe very *miracles* and *doctrine* muſt be judged according to that rule of Faith which was confirmed by Divine miracles. Thus we have examined thoſe *motives* which ſeem moſt to prove Infallibility, and ſhewn how little they agree to the *preſent Churches Infallibility.*

De Notis Eccleſiæ. cap. 14.

§. 15. 3. As to the *other motives*, what evidence do you produce, *That wherever they are, the Church is Infallible*; and, that theſe do *infallibly belong to your Church?* for both theſe muſt be made evident, or you do nothing. Now theſe motives are, *Sanctity of life, Succeſſion, Unity, Antiquity, and the very name of Catholick*, &c. How hard is it to conceive the connexion between theſe and *infallibility!* Nay, they are ſo far from it, that it hath been

been abundantly proved againſt your party, that theſe are no certain *notes* of the *true Church*, (which is a Controverſie I ſhall not now diſcuſs). And if the *Church* cannot be proved to be *true* by them, much leſs certainly will it be proved to be *Infallible*. But ſuppoſe all this, is your *Church* ſo remarkable for *Sanctity of life*, that it ſhould be a *motive* for your *Infallibility*? Have your *Popes* been indeed ſuch *Holy men*, that we may not queſtion but they were moved by the *Holy Ghoſt when they ſpake*? Certainly, you have ſome other way to know it than all *Hiſtories* both of *friends* and *enemies*, and the conſtant *fame* of the world, which hath then much abuſed us with ſtories quite of another nature. Or, is the *ſtate of your Church* ſo *pure and holy*, that it muſt ſhew it ſelf *Infallible* by that? But whom will you be judged by in this caſe? I deſire you not to ſtand to the *verdict* of your *Adverſaries*. Will you believe men of your *own Communion*? pray read what ſad complaints are made of the *degenerate ſtate* of your *Church* by *Petrarch*, *Mantuan*, *Clemangis*, *Eſpencæus*, *Eraſmus*, *Caſſander*, and ſeveral others, and judge you whether we have not reaſon to cry up the *Sanctity of your Church*. *But theſe*, (it may be you will ſay) *were diſcontented perſons*. Will you believe then your *Cardinals*? And if ever you will believe them, it ſhould certainly be, when they meet to adviſe concerning the *ſtate* of your *Church*; and was not this the expreſſion of the *Colledge* of *choſen Cardinals* for reformation of the *Church*, under *Paul* 3. *Per nos, inquimus, per nos, nomen Chriſti blaſphematur apud gentes*. Is not this a great evidence of your *Sanctity*? If you will not believe the *Cardinals*, you will not certainly queſtion the judgement of him whom you would fain have to be *Infallible*, the *Pope* himſelf. And theſe are the words of *Adrian* 6. in his *Inſtructions* to his *Legat* at the Diet of *Norimberg*, *A. D.* 1522. *Scimus in hâc Sede aliquot jam annis multa abominanda fuiſſe, abuſus in Spiritualibus, exceſſus in mandatis, & omnia deniq; in perverſum mutata*. If ever *Pope* was *Infallible* he was in ſaying ſo, and he could not but be *in Cathedrâ* when he ſaid it. You ſee then what evidence you have from your ſelves concerning that *Sanctity of life* which is in your *Church*. But it may be ſtill, you do not mean *real Sanctity*, but that the *doctrine of your Church* tends more to promote it, than that of any *other Church*. I heartily wiſh, the quite contrary could not be too truly ſaid of it, and it is well known, that one of your great *Artifices* whereby you perſwade great Perſons to your *Religion*, is, the *liberty* it indulgeth them in *ſin* here, and yet the *hopes* it gives them of *Heaven* hereafter. Our doctrine requires *indiſpenſable obedience to all the precepts of Chriſt*: Yours tells them, *thoſe which are the moſt ſtrict and ſevere, are not precepts, but counſels of perfection*. Ours, *That there is no hope of Salvation without hearty amendment of life*: Yours, *That Penance is requiſite and external ſatisfaction to the Church; and for internals, that Contrition is very commendable, but if there be not that, Attrition will ſerve the turn*. Ours, *Charges men to look to their Salvation in this life, becauſe when life is ended their eſtate is irrecoverable*: Yours, *That though men dye in their ſins, yet they may be relieved by the prayers of the living, and that there is hope they may get through Purgatory to Heaven at laſt*. So that ſuppoſing any *perſons* to own *Chriſtianity* to be *true*, it is hard to conceive there ſhould be more Artifices imagined to reconcile the *Love of the pleaſures of ſin* here with the *hopes of Heaven* at laſt, than are uſed by thoſe of your Profeſſion. So that if I ſhould ſuppoſe my ſelf a *Heathen Philoſopher*, and any of your Profeſſion ſhould come and tell me, Theſe were the *Precepts*, and theſe the *Promiſes* of *Chriſtian Religion*, but I could believe none of them, but by the *Infallible propoſition of your Church*, and that I was to know your *Church Infallible* by that *Sanctity of life* which was in it; when I had throughly conſidered not only the *im-*

pieties

pieties committed by the *great ones* of your *Religion*, even in *Rome* in the firſt place, but the *Artifices* uſed to enervate all the *Precepts* of *real Sanctity*, and ſo plainly to ſee what *intereſt* and *deſign* is carried on under all theſe *diſguiſes*: I ſhould be inſuperably aſſaulted with the thoughts that thoſe of your *Religion* who were the Authours of theſe things, were ſo far from believing your *Church Infallible*, that they really believed neither *Chriſtian* nor any other *Religion* in the world. So much for that *Sanctity of life* which is in your *Church*. As for your other motives of *Unity, Succeſſion, Antiquity, and the name of Catholick*, &c. they have ſo little affinity with any pretence of *Infallibility*, and do equally agree to thoſe *Churches*, as the *Greek* and *Abyſſine*, which you are ſo far from acknowledging Infallible, that you will not grant them to be *true Churches* (notwithſtanding theſe *Motives*) that I cannot eaſily imagine to what *end* you produced them, unleſs to let us ſee, you had the gift of *ſaying ſomething*, though *nothing* to the purpoſe.

§. 16. When you have thus apparently failed in producing any *ſhadow* of *proof* for your *Churches Infallibility by theſe motives of credibility*, we now come to ſee how good you are at the *defenſive part*, who have been ſo unhappy in your Attempts. Therefore we muſt conſider what *arts* you uſe in putting by the force of thoſe *arguments* which are produced againſt you by his *Lordſhip*. After he had urged that queſtion againſt you, *How it may appear that your Church is infallibly governed by the Holy Ghoſt*, to which we have ſeen how impoſſible it is for you to give any ſatisfactory anſwer, he proceeds to another Argument which lies in theſe words; *Beſides, this is an inviolable ground of reaſon, That the principles of any concluſion muſt be of more credit than the concluſion it ſelf. Therefore if the Articles of Faith, the Trinity, the Reſurrection, and the Reſt, be the concluſions, and the Principles by which they are proved be only Eccleſiaſtical Tradition; it muſt needs follow, that the tradition of the Church is more infallible than the Articles of Faith, if the Faith which we have of the Articles ſhould be finally reſolved into the veracity of the Churches Teſtimony.* To this your Anſwer is very conſiderable. 1. You tell us, *That the ground of all this diſcourſe is the authority of* Ariſtotle *cited in the Margent, which you repeat after him.* But I pray, Whence learn'd you that this was all the *ground* of his diſcourſe? For his *Lordſhip* doth not ſay, that *Ariſtotle* ſaith ſo, and therefore it is ſo; but ſaies, *That it is an inviolable ground of reaſon*, (which words you prudently left out, that there might appear ſome ſhadow for ſuch a cavil) and cites only the concurrent teſtimony of *Ariſtotle* with that evidence of reaſon which is in it. And will you deny this to be an undoubted principle in reaſon, that, *That which is aſſumed as the ground and reaſon why I aſſent to any thing, muſt be more certain and evident, than that is which I aſſent to on that ground?* Certainly you muſt have an *art* above all other men to make the *ſuperſtructure* ſtronger than the *foundation*; the particular *Problems* in *Mathematicks*, more *evident* than the *Poſtulata*; the *concluſion*, ſurer than the *Premiſſes*. But you think to come off this abſurdity. 2. *By diſtinguiſhing between Science and Faith*, or, as you expreſs it, *between the proceeding of the underſtanding when it works naturally and neceſſarily, by and from the evidence and clearneſs of its object: and when it works ſupernaturally and produceth ſupernatural and free acts, meerly or at leaſt principally from the impulſe and inclination of the will; for in ſuch caſes the Maxim holds not*, viz. *That the principles of a Concluſion muſt be of more credit than the concluſion it ſelf. Now the act of believing is ſuch an act; that is, which the underſtanding elicites, rather by a voluntary and free inclination and conſent of the will, than from any evident certainty in the object whereto it aſſents.* A moſt judicious and profound diſcourſe! to which

P. 61. n. 3. *Ariſtot. 1. Poſt. c. 2. T. 16.*

P. 57.

I know

I know not whether ever I can perſwade *my will*, but I am ſure, I never ſhall *my underſtanding*. Leſt you ſhould think, it is only ſome *impulſe* of *my will* which hinders my *aſſent*, I ſhall fairly lay down the Reaſons which keep me from it.

1. That all aſſent of the *underſtanding* is grounded upon *evidence*.

2. That however that *evidence* proceeds, yet the *Foundation of aſſent* muſt be more evident than the thing aſſented to. And theſe two I ſuppoſe will fully reach the ſcope of your Anſwer, by ſhewing that your diſtinction *of acts natural and ſupernatural, is both untrue and impertinent.*

1. *That all aſſent is grounded upon evidence, i. e.* that no man can aſſent to any thing *meerly becauſe he will*, but there muſt be ſufficient reaſon inducing and perſwading to that *aſſent*. You acknowledge *this to be true in acts of Knowledge, but not of Faith*; but, What do you make to be the *genus* in your definition of *Faith?* I ſuppoſe you will ſay, it is *an aſſent of the mind.* If it be ſo, the mind cannot be ſuppoſed to elicite an act of the ſame nature in ſo repugnant a manner to it ſelf, that it ſhould aſſent to any thing without *evidence*. I know what diſcourſes thoſe of your party have, concerning the *obſcurity* which is neceſſary to *Faith*. If you mean *obſcurity* as to the *object* believed, *i. e.* that the matters to be believed are not ſo *clear* to us as *demonſtrations*, I will not gainſay it: but if you mean *obſcurity* or want of *evidence*, as to the *reaſon* inducing me to believe, I utterly deny any ſuch *obſcurity* to belong to *Faith*, or to be conſiſtent with it. For *God* doth not require us to believe any thing without *ſufficient grounds* for our believing it, and thoſe *grounds* do bear a proportionable evidence to the nature of that *aſſent* which he requires. If he requires an *Infallible aſſent*, he gives *Infallible grounds*; if he requires a *firm* and *certain aſſent*, he gives *firm and certain grounds*; if he requires only a *probable aſſent*, he gives only *probable evidence*. But ſtill, ſuch as the *nature* of the *aſſent* is, ſuch is the *evidence* he gives for it. To make this plainer by an Inſtance. *That Chriſt was the true Meſſias*, he requires an *aſſent* built upon *Infallible grounds*, and therefore God gave ſuch *Infallible evidence* of it by the *Miracles* which he wrought. That theſe *Miracles* were once really done, he requires our *firm aſſent*, and therefore gives *certain evidence* by an Univerſal and uncontrouled tradition; but whether S. *Paul* or any other *Apoſtolical perſon* were Authour of the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews*, he requires only an *aſſent* built upon the moſt *probable grounds*, and therefore he hath given us no more for it. But ſtill as the *aſſent* is, ſo the *evidence* muſt be. For *Faith* being an act of the *mind*, whoſe nature is to judge according to *reaſon*, we cannot ſuppoſe any act of it to proceed in a *brutiſh manner* by a meer *impulſe* of the *will*. I deny not, but the *will* may be ſaid to have ſome kind of influence upon the underſtanding, both in furthering and hindering *aſſent*: but it is not by any command it hath over the *mind* in its *acts*, but as it can *divert* the mind from, or incline it to, the ſearching into the *evidence* of the things. Therefore when we commonly ſay, *Facile credimus quæ volumus*, and ſo on the contrary; it is not becauſe of the *wills immediate power* upon the underſtanding, but, as the *deſire* of a thing makes us *inquiſitive* after it, ſo the diſlike of it makes us unwilling to hear the *reaſons* for it, and ready to entertain any pretence againſt it. Thus, I grant, the *will* may have *power* upon the *mind as to the eliciting the act of Faith*, not that I can *aſſent* to a thing as *true*, becauſe I deſire it to be *true*; but this *inclination* of the *will* removes thoſe *impediments* which would obſtruct my diſcovery of the evidence which is in it. You have certainly a *mind* of another *mould* than others have that can believe things which do not appear *credible* to you; yet ſuch a kind of *Faith* as this, is very neceſſary for your *Churches Infallibility*; and for that, your diſcourſe

of believing by the impulſe of the will, is very proper and ſeaſonable. But other perſons may think it an *Imperfection* in their minds, that they cannot believe any thing any further than it appears *credible*; that is, that they can *go* no further than they have *legs*; nor *ſee* when their *eyes* are ſhut, or the *room dark*. But it may be, you will tell me, *All this diſcourſe proceeds on ſuppoſition, that Faith were a natural act of the mind; but you ſpeak of a ſupernatural Faith.* It may be ſo; but, I hope, you ſpeak not of an *irrational Faith*, which muſt believe things beyond the *evidence* of their *Credibility*. *Faith*, whether *natural* or *ſupernatural*, *acquired* or *infuſed*, is ſtill an *act* of the *mind*; and let it have but what belongs to it as ſuch, and call it what you will. I deny not a peculiar *Operation* of *Grace*, in the eliciting the *Act* of *Divine Faith*; but ſtill I ſay, The manner whereby it is wrought, muſt be agreeable to the *nature* of the *Underſtanding*, and by diſcovering the *Credibility* which is in the *Objects of Faith*. If you ſay, The *Aſſent* is *infuſed*, I muſt ſay, The *Evidence* is firſt *infuſed*; for as *Chriſt*, when he healed the *blind*, did not make them ſee *Objects* which did not *appear viſible*; ſo neither doth the *Spirit of God* in planting *Faith* make men diſcern *Objects* which do not appear *credible*; and the ſtronger the *Aſſent* is, the greater is the *Evidence* and *Credibility* of the Object. And can you call then that *any free inevident Aſſent*, which goes no further than the *Object* appears *credible*? It cannot be then any *Act of the Will*, but meerly of the *Mind*, which yields aſſent to any *Object* propounded as *credible* to it. So that in what way and manner *Aſſent* is required, in that ſame manner doth *God* give proportionable evidence: I deny not but that *Aſſent* is required to Objects *inevident to ſenſe* and reaſon; but then I ſay, The *aſſent* is not required to what is *obſcure* and *inevident*; but to what is *evident* to us, and therefore *credible*. In the *Incarnation of the Son of God*, the manner of the *Hypoſtatical Union* is to us *inevident*, but then *God* doth not require our Aſſent to the *Manner*, but to the *Truth* of the thing it ſelf. Where-ever *God* requires us to believe any thing as *True*, he gives us *evidence* that it is ſo: where-ever it appears the thing is *inevident*, we may lawfully *ſuſpend* our *Aſſent*, and, for all that I know, it is our *duty* ſo to do.

§. 17. But yet you have not done with this profound diſcourſe; *For you very learnedly diſtinguiſh a double proceeding in probations; the one is*, per principia intrinſeca, which you very well Engliſh (*by intrinſecal Principles*)

Ibid. i. e. *ſuch as have a neceſſary, natural connexion with the things proved, and do manifeſt and lay open the objects themſelves*; *the other is*, per principia extrinſeca (*by extrinſecal Principles*) *that is, ſuch as have no natural or neceſſary connexion with, nor do produce any ſuch evident manifeſtation of the things proved, but their efficacy*, (viz. *whereby they determine the underſtanding to aſſent*) *doth wholly depend on the worth and vertue of that external Principle, whereby ſuch probations are made. This* you apply *to Knowledge and Faith, that as Knowledge proceeds in the former way, ſo Faith doth in the later, which depends purely upon extrinſecal Principles*, viz. *the Authority, Veracity, Goodneſs and Knowledge of God affirming it; which was immediately known to the Prophets and Apoſtles, but mediately to us, which however, muſt be infallibly conveyed to us, which can only be by the teſtimony of the Church.* This is the ſubſtance of your third Section; to which I anſwer, 1. That all *Certainty* in the acts of the *Mind*, whether in *Knowledge* or *Faith*, muſt equally ſuppoſe the *Truth* of ſome *extrinſecal Principles*, viz. *the veracity and goodneſs of God*: for otherwiſe we cannot certainly judge of thoſe you call *Principia intrinſeca*, to know what things have neceſſary and natural connexion with the things proved. For, unleſs I ſuppoſe that *God* is ſo *True* and *Good*, as not to ſuffer me to be deceived

ceived in the proper *actings* of my *Faculties*, I may judge ſuch things to have connexions and dependencies one upon another, which really have nothing ſo. And therefore, ſo far your diſtinction concerning *Science and Faith*, will not hold. But, 2. If the meaning of this diſtinction be only this, That there is a different proceeding in a *demonſtration*, from what there is in *an act of Faith*, I deny it not; but ſuppoſe it nothing to your purpoſe. For, though the *evidence* be diſcovered in a *different way*, yet there is in both proportionable *evidence* to the *nature* of the *Aſſent*. When I *aſſent*, becauſe I know that the thing is *true*, the *evidence* of the *thing* it ſelf, is the *ground* of that Aſſent; but, when I *aſſent* upon the *Authority* of any *perſon*, the *Credibility* of his *Teſtimony* is the *evidence* on which that *Aſſent* is grounded. Though this later *evidence* be of another *kind*, yet it is ſufficient for that *act* of the *mind*, which is built upon it; and that Teſtimony which I eſtabliſh a firm *Aſſent* upon, muſt be as *evident* in its kind, *i. e.* of *Credibility*, as the *evidence* of a thing *demonſtrable* in the nature of a *Demonſtration*. 3. The main ſtrength of your *Anſwer* ſeems to lye in this, *That in ſuch an Aſſent as is built upon Authority; as in the caſe of Faith, when we do not immediately hear God ſpeaking, but it is conveyed to us by the Teſtimony of others, it is neceſſary that this Teſtimony be infallible.* But, good Sir, this is not our preſent Queſtion, Whether it be neceſſary that this Teſtimony be *infallibly conveyed* to us, but, ſuppoſing ſuch an *infallible Conveyance*, Whether that *infallible Teſtimony* muſt not be more *credible* than the *matters* which are believed upon it? But, as though never any ſuch thing had been ſtarted, You give us a long diſcourſe of the *different proceeding of Science and Faith*, but never offer to apply it to the buſineſs in hand. I muſt therefore ingenuouſly commend you for an excellent Art of *gliding inſenſibly* away from a buſineſs you cannot anſwer, and caſting out a great many words not to the purpoſe, that you may ſeem to touch the matter, when you are far enough from it.

And therefore I ſay, Secondly, *That however the evidence proceeds in matters of Faith, yet whatever is the Foundation of Aſſent, muſt be more evident than the thing aſſented to.* Eſpecially where you ſuppoſe the *Aſſent* to be *infallible*, and the *Teſtimony infallible*, which muſt aſcertain it to us. This will be plainer by an inſtance. If I ask you, Why you believe *the Reſurrection of the dead*, your Anſwer is, becauſe of the *Authority* of him that reveals it: The next Queſtion then is, Why you believe *that God hath revealed it*; your Anſwer is, *Becauſe the Teſtimony of the Church is infallible which delivers it.* Whereby it is plain, That though your firſt Anſwer be from *God's Authority*, yet the laſt reſolution of your *Faith*, is, the *Infallibility of your Churches Teſtimony*; and that being the *laſt reſolution*, that *Infallibility* muſt be the *Principle* on which the belief of the reſt depends. For, according to your Principles, *though God had revealed it*, yet if this *Revelation* were not atteſted by the *infallible Teſtimony* of your *Church*, we ſhould not have ſufficient ground to believe it. And if without that, we can have no ſufficient ground to believe, then this *Principle The Church is infallible*, muſt be more *credible* than *the Reſurrection of the dead*. Which was the Abſurdity his Lordſhip charged upon you, and you are far from being able to quit your ſelf of.

The next thing which you buſie your ſelf much in anſwering of, is, §. 18.
That according to theſe Principles of reſolution of Faith, you make the Churches Teſtimony the formal Object of Faith, which you acknowledge your ſelf to be a great Abſurdity, and therefore make uſe of many ſhifts to avoid. I ſhall re- P. 58. n. 4.
duce the ſubſtance of your verboſe, and immethodical Anſwer into as narrow a compaſs as I can, without defalking any thing of the ſtrength of it. You tells us then, *That our Faith is reſolved into God's Revelations,*

whether written, or unwritten, as its Formal Object; and our Infallible Aſſurance, that the things we believe as God's Revelations are revealed from him, is reſolved into the Infallibility of the Churches Definitions, teaching us, that they are his Revelations; And that the Formal Cauſe of our Aſſent in Divine Faith, is God's Revelation delivered to the Church without writing; but becauſe that is as it were at diſtance from us, it is approximated, or immediately applied to us by the infallible Declaration of the preſent Church. Hence it appears, our Faith reſts only upon God's Revelation as its Formal Object, though the Churches Voice be a condition ſo neceſſary for its reſting thereon, that it can never attain that Formal Object without it. And laſtly, you tell us, *The Churches Authority then being more known to us than the Scriptures, may well be ſome reaſon of our admitting them, yet the Scriptures ſtill retain their prerogative above the Church: and thence you diſtinguiſh of the certainty of the Object and Subject; from all which you conclude, That the Churches Definition is not the Formal Object of Faith, but that our Faith relies upon it as an Infallible Witneſs both of the written and unwritten Word of God, which is the Formal Object.* This is the ſubſtance, in your long Anſwer, of what hath the face of reaſon and pertinency: Which I come to a cloſe and particular examination of. And that you may not ſay, I paſs over this important Controverſie, without a through diſcuſſion of it; I ſhall firſt prove, that it neceſſarily follows from your Principles, That the Churches Infallible Teſtimony muſt be the Formal Object of Faith. And 2. That the Anſwers you give are far from being ſatisfactory that it is not.

1. *That it neceſſarily follows from your Principles, That the Churches Infallible Teſtimony muſt be the Formal Object of Faith.* In order to which, we muſt conſider, what the ſcope and deſign of this Diſcourſe is, concerning the *Reſolution of Faith.* The Queſtion ſtarted by Mr. *Fiſher*, in the *Conference*, was *How his Lordſhip knew Scripture to be Scripture, or, How the Divine Authority of the Scriptures was to be proved.* To this his Lordſhip returns a large Anſwer, to which you attempt a Reply in this Chapter, and mention this to be the main queſtion, *How Scriptures may be known to be the Word of God. To this,* you tell us, *No ſatisfactory Anſwer can be given, but from the Infallible Teſtimony of the Church, and the great reaſon given by you in all your diſcourſe, is this, That this is an Article to be believed with Divine Faith, and Divine Faith muſt be built on an Infallible Teſtimony.* The Queſtion then reſulting hence, is, Whether on theſe *Principles* you do not make the *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *Church*, the *Formal Object* of *Faith?* You deny, and we affirm it; but before I come to the particular Evidences of the Cauſe, ſome general *poſtulata* muſt be laid down, which by the very *ſtate* of the Controverſie, muſt be acknowledged by you, which are;

1. That the Queſtion in diſpute is not concerning the *Formal* Object of all things *divinely revealed*, but concerning the believing this to be a *particular Divine Revelation.* For, it is obvious to any one that conſiders, what vaſt difference there is between thoſe two Queſtions, *Why you believe that to be True which God hath revealed*; the plain and eaſie reſolution of this, is, into the *veracity and Infallibility of God*, in all his Revelations. But it is quite another Queſtion, when I ask, *Why you believe this to have been a True Divine Revelation?* Or that ſuch particular Books contain the Word of *God.* And it is apparent, by the whole proceſs of the Diſpute, that the Queſtion is not concerning the *firſt*, but the *ſecond* of theſe two.

2. That the Queſtion is not concerning any *kind of perſwaſion*, as to this Divine Revelation, but concerning that which you call *Divine Faith.*

3. That

3. That this *Divine Faith must be resolved into some Testimony supposed infallible*. These three are things agreed on between both parties, as appears by the whole management of this Controversie. Only you suppose this *Infallible Testimony* to be the *Church*, which your Adversary denies, and saith, It will follow from thence, that you make your *Churches Testimony the Formal Object of Faith*, which I thus prove.

1. That which is the only *Ground* and *Foundation* whereon a *Divine Faith* is built, must be the *Formal Object of Faith*: but the Infallible Testimony of your *Church*, is the only *Foundation* whereon *Faith* is built. By the *Formal Object of Faith*, I suppose you and I mean the same thing, which is the *Foundation* whereon the *Certainty* of the *Assent* is grounded, or the principal *Objective Cause of Faith*, *viz.* not every account that may be given *Why men believe*, but that which is the only *Certain Foundation* to establish a *Divine Faith* upon. Now, let any one but consider what the *Question* is, and what your resolution is, and then judge, Whether you make not the *Churches Testimony* the *Formal Object*. The Question is, How we know the *Scriptures to be the Word of God*; which in other terms is *What the ground is why I assent to the Doctrine contained in Scripture as a Divine Revelation?* You say, The *Testimony of the Scripture it self* cannot be that *ground*; You say, The *Testimony of the Spirit cannot be it*; You say, A *Moral Certainty* cannot be it, because then it is not *Divine Faith*: What then is the reason why you believe it? Do you not over and over say, It is *because of the infallible Testimony of the Church, which gives us unquestionable assurance that this was a Divine Revelation*; and yet for all this, this Testimony is not *the Formal Object* of this *Divine Faith*. The most charitable apprehension I can have of you, when you write things so inconsistent, is either that you understand not, or consider not what you write of, but take what hath been said in such cases by men of your own *party*, and right or wrong that serves for an Answer. But for all this, you tell us confidently, *That your Faith is not resolved into the voice of the Church, as into its Formal Object; but it is enough to say, Our Faith is resolved into God's Revelations (whether written or unwritten) as its Formal Object: and our infallible assurance, that the things we believe are Divine Revelations, is resolved into the Infallibility of the Churches Definitions.* These are excellent Notions if they would hang together. But, P. 53. n. 4.

1. We enquire not what is *enough to say* in such a case, but what *ground* you have for *saying* what you do. You have *enough to say* upon many subjects in this Book (or else your Book would never have swell'd to the bulk it hath) but you have generally very *little reason* for *what you say*.

2. Is that *infallible Assurance*, that the *things* we believe as *God's Revelations*, are revealed from him, a thing call'd *Faith* or no? If it be, as I hope you will not deny it, then by your own Confession, *Faith* is resolved into the *Churches Testimony* as its Formal Object; for, you say, This *Infallible Assurance* is resolved into the *Infallibility* of the *Churches* Definitions, teaching us, that they are his *Revelations*. These are your own words. And, do you yet deny this Testimony of the *Church* to be the *Formal Object of this Infallible Assurance?*

3. What is it you mean, when you say, That *Faith is resolved into God's Revelations as its Formal Object?* Is it, that the *reason* why we believe, is, *Because God hath revealed these things to us?* But that, you know, is not the *matter* at all in question, but, How we come to assent to such a *Doctrine* as a *Divine Revelation?* Answer me punctually to it; Can you possibly resolve your Faith into any thing else, as its *Formal Object?* If you can, I pray do us the favour to name it. If you resolve this *Faith*, as you seem to express your mind, *into Divine Revelation*, as its Formal Object;

ject; Shew us where that *Revelation* is extant, for which you believe *Scripture to be the Word of God*. Is it the *Scripture* it ſelf, or a *Revelation* diſtinct from it? If you ſay, It is the *Scripture it ſelf*, then you muſt make the *infallible Teſtimony* of your *Church* needleſs; for then we may have *infallible Aſſurance*, that the things we believe are *Divine Revelations*, without your *Churches Teſtimony* or Definitions: Then, what is become of the *unwritten Tradition* you mention in theſe words? If then it be demanded,
P. 56. *Why we believe ſuch Books as are contained in the Bible to be the Word of God; we anſwer, Becauſe it is a divine unwritten Tradition, that they are his Word; and this Divine Tradition is the Formal Object, whereon our Faith relyes.* Well then, our laſt reſolution of Faith is into this Divine unwritten Tradition: But whence come you to know, that this *Tradition is Divine?* Into what *Revelation* is the belief of that finally reſolved? Doth it appear to be ſo by *it ſelf*, and then why may not the *Scripture?* or hath it ſome other *Revelation*, and *Divine Tradition* to atteſt it? And then the ſame Queſtion returns concerning that, and ſo *in infinitum*, or elſe of neceſſity you muſt acknowledge one of theſe two things; Either that ſome *Divine Revelation* may ſufficiently manifeſt it ſelf, without any *infallible Teſtimony* of your *Church:* Or elſe, that this *infallible Teſtimony* muſt be the *Formal Object of Faith*. Of theſe two, chuſe which you pleaſe.

2. I prove that you muſt make the *Churches Teſtimony* the *Formal Object of Faith*, becauſe either you muſt make it ſo, or you muſt deny *Divine Revelation* to be the *Formal Object* of Faith; becauſe the reaſon is equal for both. I demand then, How you reſolve your *Belief* of the *Truth* of the *Doctrine of Chriſt?* You tell me, into *Divine Revelation*, as its *Formal Object*. I ask yet further, Why you believe the *Revelation made by Chriſt to be Divine?* Your Anſwer muſt be, either that your *Churches* Teſtimony gives you *infallible Aſſurance* of it, and then the former Argument returns: or elſe that *Chriſt manifeſted his Teſtimony to be infallible*, and therefore his *Revelation Divine*, becauſe of the *Motives of Credibility*, which accompanied his preaching. If this be your Anſwer, as it muſt be by your former diſcourſe, then by the ſame reaſon I prove your *Churches Teſtimony* to be the *Formal Object of Faith*, becauſe you have endeavoured to prove the *Churches Infallibility* by the ſame *Motives of Credibility that Moſes and Chriſt proved theirs*. Either therefore retract all your former diſcourſe, or elſe confeſs, that by the ſame reaſon that the *Divine Revelation* made by Chriſt, is the *Formal Object of Faith*, the *infallible Teſtimony* of your Church muſt be ſo too. For according to your own ſuppoſition, there are *equal Motives of Credibility*, and therefore equal obligation to believe the *Infallibility* of one as of the other.

3. If the only reaſon which makes any thing be the *Formal Object* agrees to the *Teſtimony* of your *Church*, then that Teſtimony muſt be the *Formal Object of Faith* to them that believe it. Now, that which is the only reaſon which makes any thing to be the *Formal Object of Faith*, is the Suppoſition that it is *infallible*. For, why do you reſolve your Faith finally into *Divine Revelation?* Is it not becauſe you ſuppoſe *God* to be *infallible* in all Revelations of himſelf; and therefore if your *Church be infallible*, as you ſay it is, by the ſame reaſon that muſt be the *Formal Object of Faith*; as if it were by the revelation of *God* himſelf. But here you think to obviate this objection by ſome ſtrange diſtinctions concerning your *Infallibility*. You tell us therefore, *The Churches Infallibility is not abſolutely and ſimply*
P. 58, 59. *Divine; or that God ſpeaks immediately by her Definitions: but only that ſhe is ſupernaturally infallible, by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt preſerving her from all error, in defining any thing as a point of Chriſtian Faith, that is, as a Truth revealed from God, which is not truly and really ſo revealed.* A rare

Diſtinction

Diſtinction this! You ſay afterwards, *The Churches Definition is abſolutely infallible, but yet this Infallibility is not abſolutely and ſimply Divine*: I pray tell us, What is it then? You ſay, It is *Supernatural*, but not *Divine*, and this *Supernatural Infallibility, by the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt ſecuring from all error*, but yet not *abſolutely and preciſely Divine*: I pray tell us, What *kind* of *Infallibility* that was which the *Apoſtles* had in delivering the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, was that any more than ſuch a *Supernatural Infallibility* as you fondly arrogate to your *Church, viz.* ſuch a one as might ſecure them from all error in defining any thing as a point of *Chriſtian Faith*, which was not ſo, that is, as a *Truth revealed from God*, which was not truly and really ſo revealed. And yet, I ſuppoſe, you will not deny, but thoſe who lived in the *Apoſtles* times, might reſolve their *Faith* into that *Infallibility* which they had as its *Formal Object*, and therefore why not as well into your *Churches Infallibility*, ſince you pretend to as great Infallibility in your *Church* as ever was in the *Apoſtles*. Thus, I hope, I have ſhewn it impoſſible for you, not to make the Churches Teſtimony the Formal Object of Faith, ſince you make it infallible as you do.

2. We come now to conſider, the *little evaſions* and *diſtinctions*, whereby you hope to get out of this *Labyrinth*. But having ſo manifeſtly proved, that it follows from your Principles, That the *Churches Teſtimony* is the *Formal Object of Faith*, all your diſtinctions fall of themſelves; for thereby it appears, that your *Churches* Teſtimony is not meerly a *neceſſary Condition* of believing, but is the *Formal Cauſe* and *Reaſon* of it, therefore your inſtance of *approximation in natural Cauſes, is nothing to the purpoſe*. No more is that of a *Commonwealths practiſing the ſame Laws, being an Argument that thoſe were its primitive Laws*: Unleſs you ſuppoſe it impoſſible, 1. That a *Commonwealth* ſhould ever alter its *Laws*. Or, 2. That it ſhould *practiſe* contrary to its *primitive Laws*. Or, 3. That it ſhould be *ſupernaturally Infallible* in judging which are *primitive Laws*, and which not; without theſe Suppoſitions, I ſay, That Inſtance ſignifies nothing to the buſineſs in hand; and when you have proved theſe true, I will give you a further Anſwer. Your Anſwer to *Ariſtotles Text*, or rather to that *undoubted Maxim of Reaſon*, with which the citation of *Ariſtotle* concurred, hath been conſidered already. Your Anſwer to the Teſtimony of *Canus*, is like the reſt of your diſcourſe, trivial, and not to the purpoſe; for *Canus* doth not only deny the *Churches Teſtimony* to be the *Formal Object* of *Faith*, but the neceſſity of believing its *Teſtimony* to be *infallible*. *Non intelligitur neceſſariò, quod credo docenti Eccleſiæ tanquam teſti infallibili*, are the very words of the Teſtimony cited in the Margin of his Lordſhips Books. P. 59. P. 62.

Your next *Section* affords us ſome more words, but not one drachm more of reaſon. For, How do you prove, *that the Churches Authority is more known to us than the Scriptures?* or, How can you make it appear, that there is any *Authority*, but what is *relative* to us, and therefore the diſtinction is in it ſelf ſilly, of *Authority in ſe, & quoad nos*. For, whatever hath *Authority*, hath thereby a reſpect *to ſome* it hath its *Authority* over. And, can any thing be a ground of Faith *ſimply and in it ſelf*, which is not ſo *towards us?* For the *Formal Object of Faith*, is that for whoſe ſake we believe, and therefore, if *Divine Revelation* be, as you ſay, the *Formal Object of Faith*, then it muſt be more *known to us*, than the Teſtimony of the Church: For, that muſt be more *known to us*, which is the main cauſe of *Believing*. But, if all your meaning be, that we muſt firſt know what the *Church delivers for Scripture*, before we can judge whether it were *divinely revealed* or no: I grant it to be true; but what is this to your Infallibility? Will you prove the *Infallibility of your Church* to be more

more *known to us*, than that of the *Scriptures*; and, on ſuppoſition that were true, can you then prove that the Scriptures ſhould ſtill retain their prerogative above the Church? What your Authors diſtinguiſh concerning *objective and ſubjective Certainty*, pertains not to this place; for the worth and dignity of the *Scriptures*, may exceed that of Tradition, yet, when the knowledge of that worth, relies on that Tradition, your eſteem of the one, muſt be according to your eſteem of the other. I will not here enquire, *Whether the adheſion of the Will, can exceed the clearneſs of the Underſtanding*; nor, *Whether* Ariſtotle *was unacquainted with ſubjective Certainty*; nor, *Whether our adheſion to Articles of Faith, be ſtronger than to any Principles evident to natural Reaſon*: For, I look upon all theſe Aſſertions to ſerve you in no other capacity, than as excurſions from the matter in hand; and therefore I ſhall not gratifie you ſo far as particularly to examine them. For all then that hath been yet produced by you, his Lordſhips Argument remains good, that, according to your Principles, *the Churches Teſtimony muſt be made the Formal Object of Faith*, and I am the more confirmed in it by the weakneſs of your evaſions; and, I hope, I have now made good thoſe words which you challenge his Lordſhip for, *That it were no hard thing to prove it.*

§. 19. p. 62. The next Abſurdity charged upon you by his Lordſhip, is, *That all the Authorities of Fathers, Councils, nay of Scripture too, muſt be finally reſolved into the Authority of the preſent* Roman *Church: And, though they would ſeem to have us believe the Fathers, and the Church of old; yet they will not have us take their Doctrine from their own writings, or the Decrees of Councils, becauſe, as they ſay, We cannot know by reading them, what their meaning was, but from the infallible Teſtimony of the preſent* Roman *Church teaching by Tradition. And this, he tells you, is the cunning of this device.* To which p. 60, 61. you anſwer; *By what hath been ſaid, it appears, That there is no device or cunning at all, either in taking away any thing due to the Fathers, Councils, or Scripture; or in giving too much to the Tradition of the preſent Church. For we acknowledge all due reſpect to the Fathers, and as much (to ſpeak modeſtly) as any of our adverſaries party. But they muſt pardon us, if we prefer the general interpretation of the preſent Church, before the reſult of any mans particular Phanſie. As for Scripture, we ever extol it above the Definitions of the Church, yet affirm it to be in many places ſo obſcure, that we cannot be certain of its true ſenſe, without the help of a living, infallible Judge, to determine and declare it, which can be no other than the preſent Church. And what we ſay of Scripture, may, with proportion, be applied to Ancient General Councils. For, though we willingly ſubmit to them all, yet where they happen to be obſcure in matters requiring Determination, we ſeek the aſſiſtance and direction of the ſame living Infallible Rule*, viz. the *Tradition, or the Sentence of the preſent Church.* The Queſtion is, *Suppoſing your Churches Teſtimony to be infallible, without which we can have no Aſſurance of what Fathers, Scriptures, and Councils ſay, What Authority remains among you, to any, or all of theſe?* And it is not, what reſpect, *you tells us*, you give them; (for you may as eaſily ſpeak, as believe contradictions) but what is *really* left to them, if your Opinion concerning the preſent Churches Infallibility be true. And he that cannot ſee the *cunning of this Device* of reſolving all into the Authority of the *preſent Roman Church*, will never underſtand the intereſt of your *Church*; but, it ſeems, you apprehend it ſo much, as not to ſeem to do it, and have too much *cunning* to confeſs it. But, this muſt not be ſo eaſily paſſed over, this being one of the grand *Artifices* of your *Church*, to make a great noiſe with *Fathers, Scriptures* and *Councils* among thoſe moſt, who underſtand them leaſt, when your ſelves reſolve them all into the *preſent Churches Teſtimony*. Which is firſt to *gagg them*, and then *bid them ſpeak*.

Firſt,

First, For the *Fathers*, you ſay, *You acknowledge all due reſpect to them*; but the Queſtion is, What kind of *reſpect* that is which *can be due* to them, when, let them ſpeak their minds never ſo plainly, and agree in what they pleaſe, and deliver what they will as the *Judgement* of the *Church*; yet all this can give us no *Aſſurance* at all on your Principles, unleſs your *Church* doth infallibly determine the ſame way. What then do the *Fathers* ſignifie with you? Doth the Infallibility of your *Churches Definition* depend on the conſent of the *Fathers? No*, you tell us, *She is ſupernaturally aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt*; and if ſo, I ſuppoſe the judgement of the *Fathers* is not that which ſhe relys on. But, it may be, you will ſay, *This ſupernatural Aſſiſtance directs the Church to that which was the judgement of the Fathers in all Ages.* This were ſomething indeed, if it could be proved: But then I would never read the *Fathers*, to know what their mind is, but ask your *Church* what they meant: And, though your *Church* delivers that as their ſenſe, which is as oppoſite as may be, both to their words and judgements; yet this is part of the *reſpect* due to them, not to believe whatever *they ſay themſelves*, but what *your Church* tells us *they ſay*. A moſt compendious way for interpreting *Fathers*, and making them ſure not to ſpeak any thing againſt your *Church*. Therefore I cannot but commend the ingenuity of *Cornelius Muſſus*, the *Biſhop of Bitonto*, who ſpake that out, which more wary men are contented only to think. *Ego, ut ingenuè fatear, plus uni ſummo Pontifici crediderim in his quæ myſteria fidei tangunt, quàm mille Auguſtinis, Hieronymis, Gregoriis, That I may deal freely*, ſaith he, *I would ſooner believe the Pope in matters of Faith, than a thouſand* Auguſtines, Hieromes, *and* Gregories. Bravely ſaid, and like a man that did heartily believe the *Pope's Infallibility!* And yet no more than every one will be forced to do that underſtands the Conſequence of his own Principles. And therefore *Alphonſus à Caſtro* was not to be blamed *for preferring an Epiſtle of* Anacletus (though counterfeit) *becauſe Pope, before* Auguſtine, Hierome, *or any other however holy or learned.* Theſe men underſtood themſelves, and the intereſt of their *Church*. And, although the reſt of them make *finer leggs* to the *Fathers*, than theſe do; yet when they ſeem to *croſs* their way, and entrench upon their *Church*, they find not much *kinder entertainment* for them. We may gueſs at the reſt by two of them, men of great note in their ſeveral ways, the one for *Controverſies*, the other for his *Commentaries*, *viz. Bellarmine* and *Maldonate*, and let us ſee, when occaſion ſerves, how rudely they handle the *Fathers*. If S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks againſt Tradition, it was, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *In defence of his errour, and therefore no wonder if he argued after the manner of erroneous perſons.* If he oppoſeth *Stephen the Biſhop of Rome*, in the buſineſs of *Rebaptization*; *He ſeemeth*, ſaith he, *To have erred mortally in it.* If S. *Ambroſe pronounce Baptiſm in the name of Chriſt, to be valid, without the naming other Perſons in the Trinity*; *Bellarmine* is not afraid to ſay, *That, in his judgement, his Opinion is falſe.* If S. *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *That it is better not to be preſent at the Euchariſt, than to be preſent, and not receive it*: I ſay (ſaith *Bellarmine*) *That* Chryſoſtome, *as at other times went beyond his bounds in ſaying ſo.* If S. *Auguſtine* expound a place of Scripture not to his mind, he tells him roundly, *He did not throughly conſider what he ſaid.* Do not theſe things argue that due reſpect they had for the *Fathers*? So long as they think they can make them ſerve their turns, then *Who but the Fathers*? If they appear refractory, and

In cap. 14. ep. ad Rom.

Huic Anacleto ſoli magis crediderim, &c. quàm Hieronymo, Auguſtino, aut cuivis alii recentiori, quantumlibet docto & ſancto. Adverſ. hæreſ. l. 6. verbo Epiſcopus.

Reſpondeo, Cyprianum hoc ſcripſiſſe cùm errorem ſuum tueri vellet, & ideo non mirum ſi errantium more tunc ratiocinaretur. De verbo Dei. l. 4. c. 11.

Videtur, mortaliter peccâſſe. De Pontif. R. l. 4. c. 7.

Hæc opinio falſa eſt, meo judicio. De Pontif. l. 4. c. 12.

Dico, Chryſoſtomum ut quædam alia per exceſſum ita locutum eſſe. De Miſſa. l. 2. c. 10.

Reſpondeo, Auguſtinum non expendiſſe locum hunc diligenter. De Euch. l. 1. c. 11.

will not serve as *hewers of wood*, and *drawers of water* to them, then *Who are the Fathers?* it is the *Churches* judgement they rely on, and not the *Fathers*. And therefore they never want ways themselves of eluding all the Testimonies produced out of them: If they cannot say, those *Testimonies* are *forged* (as some of them say it, without any shew of reason, concerning that part of the Epistle of *Epiphanius*, about the tearing the vail, in which an Image was painted at *Anablatha*.) And as *Bellarmine* answers concerning the Author of the *imperfect work* on *Matthew*, because he saith, *There is no way to the finding Truth, but reading the Scriptures*; he therefore saith, This whole place was inserted by the *Arrians*; as though that had been any part of the *Controversie* between the *Arrians* and others. If *Origen*, or *Cyril*, on *Leviticus*, saith, *It is necessary to follow the Scriptures*, then an Answer is ready, That these *Homilies* are of no great Authority: but if these will serve *to defend the Apocrypha*; if they speak of the *Obscurity of Scripture*; if they mention *the observation of Lent*; if they speak of any thing *tending to Auricular Confession*, or *Penance*, then they are good and authentick enough. Thus the price of the *Fathers* rises and falls according to their *Use*, like *Slaves* in the market. If yet the *Fathers* seem to deliver their judgements peremptorily in a matter contrary to the present sense of their *Church*, then either they speak it in the *heat of disputation*, or, if not, they were *contradicted* by *others* as good as they; if many of them concur, yet it was but their *private judgement*, not the sense of the *Catholick Church* which they delivered. Still we see, the *rate* the *Fathers* stand at, is their agreement with the *present Roman-Church*, if they differ from this, they were *Men* like others, and might be deceived, only the *Pope* is *infallible*, or at least the *present Roman-Church*. For, if *Hilary*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostome*, *Cyril*, *Augustine*, and others say, that Christ, when he said, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church*, understood *Peter's Confession* or *himself*, *Nihil magis alienum à sensu Christi cogitari potuit*, saith *Maldonate*, *Nothing could be more incongruous than what they say*. And in the next words tells us, *That all the Ancient Writers except* Hilary, *expounded*, *the gates of Hell one way*, *but he gives another sense of them*. The same liberty he takes in very many other places. By which we have a *taste* of that *due respect* which you owe to the *Fathers*, which is, *To value them*, *as far as they concur with your Church*, *and no more*; otherwise they are but the results of mens particular fancies, and not to be compared with the *infallible Judgement* of your *Church*.

De verbo Dei. l. 4. c. 11.
Ibid.
Dict. D. l. 1. c. 9.
l. 3. c. 1.
l. 4. c. 9.
De Purit. l. 3. c. 7. & l. 4. c. 9.
In Mat. 16. 18.
In Mat. 21. 9.
In Mat. 19. 11.
In Joh. 6. n. 69.
In Joh. 6. n. 115.

§. 20. But, though it may not be so evident, that you give so great respect to the *Fathers*, yet it is notorious what reverence you shew to the *sacred Scriptures*. *As for Scripture* (say you) *we ever extol it above the Definitions of the Church*: What, *ever*! Do you think we have forgot the brave comparisons which have been made by your Writers, to shew the respect you bear to the Scriptures? Is it not much for the honour of the *Scriptures*, to be said to have *no more Authority than Æsops Fables*, *without the Testimony of the Church*? Did not those extol it *above the Church*, who call'd it, *A Nose of Wax*? And were not these some of you? Doth not *Bellarmine* profess his high esteem of the Scriptures, when he saith, That *the Scripture is no more to be believed*, *in saying*, *It is from God*, *than Mahomets Alcoran*, *because that says so too*? Did not *Caranza* prefer *the Scripture before the Church*, when he said, *That the Scripture must be regulated by the Church*, *and not the Church by the Scripture*? I need not mention *Eckius* his *Evangelium nigrum* and *Theologia atramentaria*, *Pighius* his *plumbea Lesbiæ regula*, *Valentia* his *Lapis Offensionis*, *Bellarmin's* Com-

Hermannus ait, *Scripturas valere quantum fabulas Æsopi*, *si destituantur Ecclesiæ auctoritate & responsis Brentio*. V. Bailly tract. 1. q. 17.

Sint Scripturæ, *quidam velut nasus cereus*, *qui se horsum*, *illorsum*, *trahi*, *retrahi*, *fingi*, *frustè permittit*. Albert. Pighius. Hierarch. l. 2. c. 2.

Licet Scriptura dicat libros Prophetarum & Apostolorum esse divinos, *tamen non credam illos*, *nisi primum credidero Scripturam esse divinam*: *nam in Alcorano Mahometa ita loquitur ipsum Alcoranum de cœlo à Deo missum*, *& tamen ei non credimus*. De verbo Dei l. 3. c. 4.

Scriptura debet ab Ecclesia regulari, *& non contra*. Caranza Controv. 1.

Eckh. Controvers. l. 1. c. 2.

Valentia l. 1. c. 2. de Analys. Fid.

Bellarm. l. 4. c. 12. de verbo Dei.

Commonitorium utile, which, and many others, are remaining Teſtimonies of *that monſtrous eſteem*, which thoſe of your party have of the *ſacred Scriptures*. But, if the *eſteem* you have of the *Scriptures* be ſo great, Why lock you them up ſo carefully from the people in an unknown language? Is it, leſt *ſuch Jewels* ſhould loſe their luſtre by too often uſing? Why are you ſo ſevere againſt your *Proſelytes* reading them, Is it becauſe you would not caſt *Pearls before Swine?*

But ſtill you extol the Scripture above the Definitions of the *Church*: How is that poſſible, when you tell us, *The only Authority it hath, is from the Churches Teſtimony?* For the *Authority* of it ſuppoſeth it to be acknowledged for a *Divine Revelation*, and that, you tell us, we can have no Aſſurance of, but from your *Churches Definition*: And we had thought, that which gave *Credit* and *Authority*, had been greater than that which *received* it. There can be then little reaſon to take your word in a caſe of this nature, when your very next words give ſo palpable a reaſon to the contrary. For you ſuppoſe *the Scripture unable to expreſs it ſelf to any intent or purpoſe, unleſs your Church be the Interpreter. For the Scripture*, ſay you, *being in many places obſcure, we cannot be certain of its true ſenſe, without the help of a living and infallible Judge, to determine and declare it; which can be no other than the preſent Church.* I anſwer, 1. Your meaning is not ſo plain, but that it wants the interpretation of your *Church* too. For what do you underſtand by the *Scriptures being in many places obſcure?* Is it only, that there are ſome paſſages which have their *difficulties* in them? But what is this to the purpoſe, unleſs you could prove, that this *obſcurity* is ſuch as hinders it from being a *Rule of Faith and Manners?* If you prove that, you do ſomething. The *Scripture* we acknowledge hath its *difficulties* in it, but not ſuch as hinder the great deſign *God* intended it for; no more than the *macula* which are in the *Sun*, hinder it from giving light to the world; or ſome *crabbed pieces* in our *Laws* hinder them from being owned as the *Laws of the Land*. 2. Are thoſe places *obſcure* or no, which ſpeak of the *Churches Infallibility?* at leaſt ſuch as you produce for it afterwards? This is evident, that there are no places whoſe ſenſe is more *controverted* than theirs: Can theſe then be underſtood without a *living* and *infallible Judge*, or no? If they may, ſo as we may be certain of their true ſenſe, then why not all others which concern the *Rule of Faith* and manners, whoſe ſenſe is far leſs diſputed than of theſe? If not, then we muſt ſuppoſe a *living and infallible Judge*, before we know whether there is ſuch *a one* or no: For that is the thing enquired after in the meaning of theſe *places*, and you ſay, We cannot be certain of their *ſenſe* without him, ſo that we muſt firſt ſuppoſe the thing to be *true*, and then *prove it*; or elſe you run back again into your old *Labyrinth*. *How know you that God hath promiſed, there ſhall be ſuch an infallible Judge? By ſuch places* (ſay you) *as you produce for it.* Well, but the *Scripture being in many places obſcure*, How ſhall I be certain this is the true ſenſe of them? You ſay, becauſe the *preſent Church is the living and infallible Judge to determine and declare it.* Do not you herein argue like a man, that can *ſquare Circles?* 3. In thoſe places whoſe *ſenſe*, you ſay, is ſo *obſcure*, Where hath *God* made it neceſſary for us to have the certain *ſenſe* of them? You can have no pretence for all this for an infallible Judge, unleſs you could make it evident, that *God* hath left no myſteries in his Word, but he hath left your *Church* a *Key* to unlock them; and therefore, I hope, there is a *Clavis Apocalyptica* too hanging at your *Churches Girdle*. It is true indeed, your *Church* is happily inſtrumental in explaining a *myſtery* ſpoken of in Scripture, but not much for your comfort, it is a *myſtery of Iniquity*. But in good earneſt, do you think *That God hath promiſed a living and infallible Judge to make us certain of the ſenſe of obſcure places in Scripture?* Then two things will neceſſarily follow from

thence. 1. That it muſt be neceſſary, that all thoſe that believe this *infallible Judge* muſt know the certain *ſenſe* of theſe *obſcure places*. 2. That this infallible *Judge* muſt give the certain ſenſe of theſe places. But then, Why hath your *preſent Church* ſo neglected her *Talent* this way, that ſhe hath not decided all the Controverſies concerning the *difficiliora loca*? Such a *Commentary* as this were worth inquiring after. But yet, ſuppoſing your *Church* had done this, Could we be more certain of the *ſenſe* of your *Church*, than we are now of the *Scriptures*? I will ſuppoſe your *Church* ſo charitable, as to put ſo uſeful a thing in writing, for the general good of the world: But *all Writings* (you tell us) *are obſcure, and want a living Judge to interpret them*; and ſo conſequently muſt that, and ſo *in infinitum*. But 4. All this while it is worth underſtanding, how you prefer the *Scripture before the Church*, when you make the *Church the living and infallible Judge*, to interpret the *Scriptures*. You make the Scripture a *dead Letter*, but your Church is a *living Judge*, you make the *ſenſe* of Scripture *obſcure*, *uncertain*, and therefore giving occaſion to all the *errours* in the world, but your *Church is infallible*, to determine all Controverſies, and yet for all this, you *prefer the Scripture before the Church*. It is plain, you do not, in regard of *evidence* and *certainty*; and, one would have thought, theſe had been the greateſt *Excellencies* of a *Rule of Faith*. Do you prefer it as ſuch before your *Church*? If not, you deny it the peculiar *property* and *deſign* of it; and therefore whatever elſe you attribute to it, you are guilty of the higheſt diſparagement of it. Juſt as if one ſhould commend a *Mathematicians Square* for the *materials* of it, or the *Excellency* of the *Figures* engraven on it; but, in the mean time, tell him, It is *oblique*, *crooked*, *uncertain*, and he cannot draw a *ſtraight line* by it: Do you think he would believe you commended his *Square*? Juſt ſo do you commend the *Scriptures*; and can you then imagine, that any rational man will believe, that you *do prefer the Scriptures before the preſent Church*?

§. 21. It is next to be conſidered, what *reſpect* remains *due* to *general Councils*, if the *preſent Church* be ſuppoſed infallible. *For* (ſay you) *though you willingly*
P. 61. *ſubmit to them all, yet where they happen to be obſcure in matters requiring Determination, we ſeek the aſſiſtance and direction of the ſame living infallible Rule*, viz. *the Tradition, or the Sentence of the preſent Church*. But 1. You ſay, *You ſubmit to them all*: but, Do you ſubmit to them all as *infallible*, or no? which you muſt of neceſſity do, or elſe apparently contradict your ſelf (which yet is no novelty for you to do) for you ſpend a great deal of pains to prove *general Councils infallible*; and therefore I hope you own them as *infallible* your ſelf. If you own them to be *infallible*, what need of the ſentence of the *preſent Church*, as to thoſe *Decrees* which you already acknowledge infallible? Or, do you really own them no further to be *infallible*, than as they agree with the ſentence of the *preſent Church*? and then, I pray, What doth the pretended *Infallibility* of *general Councils* ſignifie, if your *Church* give all the Authority to them? And what conſents with your *Church* is infallible, and what doth not, is far from being ſo? 2. You ſay, *General Councils may happen to be obſcure in matters requiring Determination*; Do you mean, in *things decreed* by them, or not? If not, it is no wonder if they be obſcure in matters they never meddle with; therefore, I ſuppoſe, you mean in *things determined* by them. Then I further ask, Whether theſe *Decrees of general Councils*, were the *Sentence* of the *preſent Church*, to thoſe who lived in the time of thoſe *Councils*? If they were, How could the Sentence of the *preſent Church* declare and determine the ſenſe of what is *obſcure in Scripture*, if, notwithſtanding this Determination, the Sentence of the *Church* remains as *obſcure*, as the *ſenſe of the Scripture*? *If it was not obſcure then, but is ſo now*, whence comes that *obſcurity*? The Sentence of the *Council* is ſuppoſed to be written then, that thoſe who were not preſent at it might underſtand the

Decree

Decree of it; and it is ſuppoſed we have the very ſame *Authentical Decrees of Councils*, which they had who lived in the ſeveral *Ages* of them. How come they then to be more obſcure to us, than they were to them? 3. What do you mean by matters *requiring Determination?* Is it not enough that things be infallibly determined once, but they muſt be determined over again? If the former *Determination* were *infallible*, what need any more? or doth the *Infallibility* ceaſe as ſoon as the *Church* ceaſeth to be the *preſent Church*, and then that which comes to be the *preſent Church*, muſt convey an *Infallibility* into it? but how comes any thing which was once infallible, to *loſe* its *Infallibility?* which is a thing really ſo *obſcure*, that your preſent Church would do well to help us out in it. But if, notwithſtanding all your pretence of the Infallibility of *general Councils*, nothing is truly to be owned as ſuch, but what agrees with the Sentence of the *preſent Church*, then we plainly ſee, what reverence you ſhew to all *general Councils*, even as much as the *preſent Church* will let you, and no more, which, ſuppoſing it never ſo great, is not ſhewed to the *Councils*, but to your *Church*. For, the reaſon of that *Reverence* cannot be reſolved into the *Councils*, but into that *Church* for whoſe ſake you reverence them. And thus it evidently appears, That *the cunning of this device* is wholly your own, and notwithſtanding theſe miſerable ſhifts, you do finally reſolve all Authorities of the *Fathers*, *Councils*, and *Scriptures*, into the Authority of the *preſent Roman-Church*; which was the thing to be proved.

§. 22. The firſt *Abſurdity* conſequent from hence, which the *Arch-Biſhop* chargeth your party with, is, *That by this means they aſcribe as great Authority* (*if not greater*) *to a part of the Catholick Church, as to the whole, which we believe in our Creed; and which is the Society of all Chriſtians. And this is full of Abſurdity in nature, in reaſon, in all things, that any part ſhould be of equal worth, power, credit, or authority with the whole.* Here you deny the Conſequence, which, you ſay, *depends upon his Lordſhips wilfully miſtaken Notion of the Catholick Church; which he ſaith, Is the Church we believe in our Creed, and is the Society of all Chriſtians; which* (*you call*) *a moſt deſperate extenſion of the Church*; becauſe thereby (forſooth) it will appear, that a part is not ſo great as the whole, *viz. that the Roman-Church, in her full latitude, is but a piece or parcel of the Catholick Church believed in our Creed.* Is this all the deſperate *Abſurdity*, which follows from his Lordſhips Anſwer? I pray, ſhew it to have any thing tending to an *Abſurdity* in it? And though you confidently tell us, *That the Roman-Church, taken as comprizing all Chriſtians that are in her Communion, is the ſole and whole Catholick Church*; yet I will contentedly put the whole iſſue of the cauſe upon the proof of this one Propoſition, that the *Roman-Church* in its largeſt ſenſe, *is the ſole and whole Catholick Church*; or that the *preſent Roman-Church* is a ſound member of *the Catholick Church.* Your evidence from *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, is ſuch as I fear not to follow you in; but, I beſeech you, have a care of treading too near the *Apoſtles heels*: That *any were accounted Catholicks meerly for their Communion with the Roman-Church*; or *that any were condemned for Hereſie or Schiſm purely for their diſſent from it*; prove it when you pleaſe, I ſhall be ready (God willing) to attend your Motions. But it is always your faculty, when a thing needs proving moſt, to tell us what you *could have done*: This, you ſay, *You would have proved at large, if his Lordſhip had any more than ſuppoſed the contrary*: But your Readers will think, that his Suppoſition, being grounded on ſuch a Maxim of Reaſon, as that mentioned by him, it had been your preſent buſineſs to have proved it: but I commend your prudence in adjourning it; and, I ſuppoſe, you will do it, as the *Court of Areopagus* uſed to do hard cauſes, *in diem longiſſimum.* It is apparent, *the Biſhop ſpeaks not of a part of the Church by repreſentation of the whole*, which is an objection no body but your ſelf would here

here have fancied; and therefore your Inſtance of a *Parliament* is nothing to the purpoſe, unleſs you will ſuppoſe, that *Councils in the Church* do repreſent in ſuch a manner as *Parliaments in England* do; and that their deciſion is obligatory in the ſame way as *Acts of Parliament* are: if you believe this to be good *Doctrine*, I will be content to take the Objecters place, and make the *Application*.

P. 62. The next Abſurdity laid to your charge, is, as you ſumm it up, *That in your Doctrine concerning the Infallibility of your Church, your proceeding is moſt unreaſonable, in regard you will not have recourſe to Texts of Scripture, expoſition of Fathers, propriety of Language, Conference of Places, Antecedents and Conſequents*, &c. *but argue, that the Doctrine of the preſent Church of* Rome, *is true and Catholick, becauſe ſhe profeſſeth it to be ſuch, which, ſaith he, is to prove* idem per idem. To this you anſwer, *That as to all thoſe helps you uſe them with much more candour than Proteſtants do: And, why ſo? Becauſe of their manifold wreſtings of Scriptures and Fathers.* Let the handling the Controverſies of this Book, be the evidence between us in this caſe, and any indifferent Reader be the Judge. You tell us, *You uſe all theſe helps*: but to what purpoſe do you uſe them? Do you by them prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church?* If not, the ſame Abſurdity lyes at your door ſtill, of proving *idem per idem*. No, *that you do not*, you ſay: But how doth it appear? Thanks to theſe *mute perſons*, the *good Motives of Credibility*, which come in again at a *dead lift*, but do no more ſervice than before. I pray, cure the *wounds* they have received already, before you rally them again, or elſe, I aſſure you, what ſtrength they have left, they will employ it againſt your ſelves. You ſuppoſe, no doubt, your *Colewort* good, you give them us ſo often over; but I neither like proving nor eating *idem per idem*.

§. 23. But yet we have two Auxiliaries more in the field, call'd *Inſtances*. The deſign of your firſt *Inſtance*, is, to ſhew, *That if your Church be guilty of proving* idem per idem, *the Apoſtolical Church was ſo too*. For you tell us, *That a Sectary might, in the Apoſtles times, have argued againſt the Apoſtolical Church, by the very ſame method his Lordſhip here uſes againſt the preſent Catholick Church.*

P. 52, 53. n. 5. *For, if you ask the Chriſtians then, Why they believe the whole Doctrine of the Apoſtles, to be the ſole true Catholick Faith, their Anſwer is, Becauſe it is agreeable to the Doctrine of Chriſt. If you ask them, How they know it to be ſo, they will produce the words, ſentences, and works of Chriſt, who taught it. But, if you ask a third time, By what means they are aſſured, that thoſe Teſtimonies do indeed make for them or their cauſe, or are really the Teſtimonies and Doctrine of Chriſt, they will not then have recourſe to thoſe Teſtimonies or Doctrine, but their Anſwer is, They know it to be ſo, becauſe the preſent Apoſtolick Church doth witneſs it. And ſo by conſequence prove* idem per idem. *Thus the Sectary.* I know not whether your faculty be better at framing Queſtions or Anſwers to them; I am ſure it is extraordinary at both. Is it not enough to be in a *Circle* your ſelves, but you muſt needs bring the *Apoſtles* into it too? at leaſt, if you may have the management of their Doctrine, you would do it. The ſhort Anſwer to all this, is, That the ground why the *Chriſtians* did aſſent to the *Apoſtles Doctrine*, as true, was, becauſe *God* gave ſufficient evidence, that their *Teſtimony was infallible*, in ſuch things where ſuch *Infallibility* was requiſite.

P. 55. For you had told us before, That the *Apoſtles did confirm their words with ſigns that followed, by which ſigns all their hearers were bound to ſubmit themſelves unto them, and to acknowledge their words for infallible Oracles of Truth.* Was not here then ſufficient ground for aſſent in the *Primitive Chriſtians*, to the *Apoſtles Doctrine*? Not as you weakly imagine, becauſe the *Doctrine of the Apoſtles* was ſuitable to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*; for the ground why they aſſented to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, was, becauſe of the *Teſtimony* of the *Apoſtles*. And therefore, to ſay, They believed the *Doctrine*

of

of the *Apostles*, because it was agreeable to the *Doctrine of Christ*, and then that they believed the *Doctrine of Christ*, because it was suitable to the *Testimony* of the *Apostles*, is a *Circle* fit for none but your self, and that silly person of your own moulding, whom you call the *Sectary*. It were worth considering too, *How the works of Christ could prove the Doctrine of the Apostles suitable to his own*. I had thought *Christs works* had proved his own *Testimony* to be *true*, and not the *Apostles Doctrine* to be consonant to his: The *works of Christ* shew us the reason, why he was to be believed in what he delivered; and did not the *works of the Apostles* do so too? What need then any rational person enquire further, why the *Apostles Doctrine* was to be believed? Was it not on the same account that the *Doctrine of Christ* was to be believed? But, say you, *How should you know their Doctrine was the same?* What, do you want an infallible Testimony for this too? or, do you believe that *God* can contradict himself; or that *Christ* should send such to deliver his *Doctrine* to the world, and attest it with *miracles* who should falsifie and corrupt it? Now, you will say, *I am come over to you, and answer as you do, that the Apostles Testimony was to be believed, because of the pregnant and convincing Motives of Credibility*. This, I grant; but must be excused as to what follows, That *these same Motives moved the Primitive Christians, and us, in our respective times, to believe the Church*. Prove but that, and I yield the cause. But till then, I pray, give us leave to believe that still you prove *idem per idem*; and your Answers are like your Proofs; for this we have had often already, and have sufficiently examined before: as likewise your other *Coccysm* about the *Formal Object of Faith*, and *certain inducements* to accept the *Churches Infallibility*; which I shall not think worth repeating, till you think what I have said against it before, worth answering.

Your second Instance is, *ad hominem*; whereby you would prove, *That if he acknowledge the Church infallible in Fundamentals, he must prove* idem per idem, *as much as you do. For* (say you) *if he be demanded a reason why he believes such Points as he calls Fundamental, his Answer is, because they are agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ. If he be asked, How he knows them to be so, he will, no doubt, produce the words, sentences and works of Christ, who taught the said Fundamental Points. But, if he be asked a third time, By what means he is assured, that these Testimonies do make for him, then he will not have recourse to the words themselves,* i. e. *to the Bible, but his final Answer will be, He knows them to be so, and that they do make for him, because the present Church doth infallibly witness so much from Tradition, and according to Tradition, which is* (say you) *to prove* idem per idem, *as much as we*. Things are not always just as you would have them: If we allow you to make both Objections and Answers for us, no doubt you are guilty of no Absurdity so great, but we shall be equally guilty of it. But, it is the nature both of your *Religion* and *Arguments* not to be able to stand a *Tryal*: but however, they must undergo it. I say then, that granting the *Church infallible* in the belief of *Fundamentals*, it doth not follow that we must prove *idem per idem*, as you do. For, when we ask you, Why you believe your Doctrine to be the *sole Catholick Faith*, your final Answer is, because *your Church is infallible*; which is answering by the very *thing* in Question, for you have no other way to judge of the *Catholick Faith*, but by the *Infallibility of your Church*; but when you ask us, Why we believe such an Article to be *Fundamental*; as for Instance, *That Christ will give Eternal Life to them that obey him*, we answer, not because the *Church*, which is infallible in *Fundamentals*, delivers it to be so, which were answering *idem per idem*; but we appeal to that common reason which is in mankind, Whether, if the Doctrine of *Christ* be true, this can be other than a *Fundamental Article* of it; it being that, without which the whole design of *Christian Religion* comes to nothing. Therefore you much

P. 63.

mistake,

miſtake, when you think we reſolve our Faith of *Fundamentals* into the *Church* as the *infallible Witneſs* of them; for, though the *Church* may be *infallible* in the belief of all things *Fundamental* (for otherwiſe it were not a *Church*, if it did not believe them) it doth not thence neceſſarily follow, That the *Church* muſt *infallibly witneſs* what is *Fundamental*, and what not. It is ſufficient that the *Church* doth deliver from the conſent of univerſal Tradition, that *infallible Rule of Faith* (which, to be ſure, contains all things Fundamental in it) though ſhe never meddle with the deciding what Points are *Fundamental*, and what not. If you therefore ask me, Why I believe any Point ſuppoſed *Fundamental*, I anſwer, By all the evidence which aſſures me, that the *Doctrine* containing that Point, is of *Divine Revelation*; If you ask me, How I know that this *Point* is part of that *Doctrine*, I appeal to the *common ſenſe* and *reaſon* of the world, as to things plainly *Fundamental*, and therefore by this means your third Queſtion is prevented, *How I know this to be the meaning of thoſe words*; for, I ſuppoſe, no one that can tell, that two and two make four, can queſtion but if the *Doctrine of Chriſt* be true, the belief of it is neceſſary to Salvation, which is it we mean by *Fundamental*. Either therefore prove it neceſſary, that the *Church* muſt *infallibly witneſs* what is *Fundamental*, and what not; and that we muſt rely on ſuch a Teſtimony in the *belief* of *Fundamentals*, or you prove nothing at all to your purpoſe, no more than your convincing *Motives of Credibility*, which, were they made into a *grand Sallad*, would know the way to the *Table*, they are ſerved ſo often up: But, I have found them ſo dry, and inſipid already, I have no encouragement to venture on them any more.

§. 24. But, ſtill you are deſervedly afraid we ſhould not think worthily enough of your Churches Infallibility. You therefore tell us very wiſely, that this
P. 63. l. 50. Infallibility is not a thing, that is not infallible; *For*, ſay you, *Which Infallibility muſt come from the Holy Ghoſt, and be more than humane or moral, and therefore muſt be truly ſupernatural, &c.* It is well you tell us of ſuch a rare diſtinction of Infallibility; for elſe, I aſſure you, we had never thought of it, *viz.* of an *Infallibility that may be deceived*, and an *Infallibility that cannot be deceived*, or, in your words, a *humane and moral Infallibility*, and a *ſupernatural divine Infallibility*. To eaſe you therefore of your fears, I ſolemnly promiſe you, that when I believe your *Church infallible*, I will not believe it to have a *humane, moral Infallibility*, but *ſupernatural and divine*, That is, when I believe her infallible, I believe her infallible. Your mind being eaſed of this grand fear, you think all the difficulty is over, and that you are out of any poſſibility of a *Circle*; but I have endeavoured before to ſhew, you are not infallible in that: For the charge you exhibit againſt the *Biſhop, as though you had left him tumbling in the Circle you had ſo eaſily got out of*; I ſhall conſider it in its due time and place; but, if one may gueſs at being in a *Circle* by *tumbling*, you will not ſeem very free from it, who ſeem to be at very little eaſe by your impatience of being held to the *ſubject* in hand.

Well, but yet our Conceptions muſt once more be rectified as to the nature of this Infallibility; before our danger was leaſt, we ſhould have believed it
P. 64. n. 6. *to be only a humane, moral, and not ſupernatural Infallibility*, and now *we are bid have a care leſt we think it to be any more, than in a ſort, and in ſome manner divine*. But, what kind of tranſcendental thing is this Infallibility? It is not *humane*, nor yet *divine*, and yet it is *ſupernatural*; which is ſcarce *in ſome ſort*, or *in a manner* ſenſe. How comes it to be *ſupernatural*, if it be not *divine*? Or, is it *naturally ſupernatural*, and *humanely divine*? It muſt not then be called *divine*, but, *in a manner, and after a ſort*: *But yet* (ſay you) *ſo far as concerns preciſe Infallibility, or certain Connexion with Truth, it is ſo truly ſupernatural and certain, that in this reſpect it yields nothing to the Scripture it ſelf.* Theſe are your own words: And if you did not believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, I

ſhould

ſhould think this the greateſt *non-ſenſe* in the world. But, What doth that *Infallibility* which is more than *in a ſort divine*, import beyond what you aſſert doth belong to the Church? Is that any more than *preciſe Infallibility*, and *certain Connexion with Truth*, and ſuch as is in the *Scripture*, and all this your *Church* hath, and yet, when we ſay ſo, ſhe drops a *Court'ſie*, and crys, *No, forſooth, though ſhe be infallible*, yet ſhe deſires to be excuſed, *ſhe is not infallible, but only as if one ſhould ſay in a manner, and after a ſort, and ſo forth.* Juſt as if one ſhould ask a new married woman, Whether ſhe were *certainly* married to ſuch a man, and ſhe ſhould anſwer *as to what concerns marrying, ſhe was certainly married*, but yet ſhe was not *abſolutely married*, but only *in a manner, and after a ſort*. This is ſo great a myſtery, you will oblige the world much to inform it a little more fully in theſe following Queſtions, What kind of *Infallibility* that is, which is *ſupernatural*, and *by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, which is equal to the Scripture it ſelf in point of Certainty and Infallibility* (your own words) and yet is not *divine*, but *in a manner, and after a ſort*: P. 64. l. 46. And what way we ſhould come to underſtand *that manner and ſort*, and what *degrees* and *ſorts* there are in *Infallibility?* Whether any thing, ſo far as it is *infallible*, be not *abſolutely*, as well as *preciſely infallible*: and whether that which is but *in a ſort divine*, be not *in a ſort not divine*; Whether that which is *in a ſort not divine*, be not likewiſe in the *ſame ſort not infallible* (ſince all this Infallibility, by your own Confeſſion, is from the *Holy Ghoſt*) and whether this be not an excellent way *in a manner*, and *after a ſort*, to reconcile Contradictions. For, if a man ſhould ask you, Whether one might be, and not be, at the ſame time; you might eaſily tell him, That *abſolutely* and *preciſely* he cannot be, and not be; but *in a manner*, and *after a ſort*, he may be, and not be, together. You have cauſe therefore to make much of this diſtinction, and you never need fear baffling, as long as you carry it about with you; it is a moſt excellent preſervative againſt all the *batteries of ſenſe and reaſon*. But leſt yet, for all this, we ſhould apprehend ſomething by this *in a manner*, and *after a ſort*, as though they were ſome odd diminiſhing terms: You tell us, *No*; *Catholick Divines, by this manner of ſpeaking, do not intend to deny the Church to be equal even to Scripture it ſelf in point of Certainty and Infallibility.* What is now become of our *manner and ſort*, when the *Church* dares *juſtle* with the *Scripture* for the *upper hand*, at leaſt for an equal place as to *Infallibility?* Ibid. What then is the intent of this diſtinction? *It is to ſhew the prerogatives of Scripture above the Definitions of the Church.* This doth well however to follow the reſt, it comes ſo near to a contradiction, for if the *Church* be equal to *Scripture* in point of Certainty and Infallibility, What prerogative can be left to the *Scripture* above the *Church?* when that which makes it Scripture, and the Rule of Faith is only its *Certainty* and *Infallibility?* Yes, you tell us, *The Scripture doth much exceed the Church in regard of its larger extent of Truth: becauſe there not only every reaſon, but every word and tittle is matter of Faith; but in the Definitions of the Church, neither the arguments, reaſons, nor words, are abſolutely ſpeaking matters of Faith, but only the thing declared to be ſuch.* Excellent good ſtill, and all of a piece! I commend you, that you would not offer to mix any thing of *ſenſe* in ſo good a diſcourſe: For 1. How comes the *Scripture* to have a larger *extent* of *Truth*, than the *Church*, if we cannot know what *Truth* is in the *Scripture*, but from the *Church?* 2. How *every word and tittle* comes to be *matter of Faith in Scripture*, and not in the *Church*, when you ſay, The *Church* is equal to the *Scripture* in point of *Certainty and Infallibility?* 3. How any *word and tittle* can be any where a *matter* of *Faith?* I had thought, it had been the *ſenſe* and *thing* underſtood by thoſe *words*, had been *matters of Faith*; and then it is all one with the *Scripture* and *Church*; for you ſay, as to the *Church*, the thing declared is a *matter of Faith?* 4. What that thing is, which is declared by the *Church*,

which is neither *arguments, reaſons nor words*; and if it doth conſiſt of theſe, how one can be believed, and not the other: Doth your *Church* declare things ſo *nakedly*, as to do it *without arguments, reaſons or words? That ſhe can do it without words*, it is hard to believe, but very eaſie that ſhe can do it without *arguments or reaſons*. 5. Are men bound to believe what ſhe ſo declares, *without arguments and reaſons* too? If they be, ſhew whence that *Obligation* comes; and when you attempt that, you endeavour to ſhew ſome *argument and reaſon* why they ſhould believe it. 6. What do you mean, that *theſe arguments, reaſons and words, are not abſolutely ſpeaking matters of Faith?* it ſhould ſeem then, that *conditionally* they may be ſo, and then ſhew the difference between them, and thoſe in *Scripture*. 7. How is it poſſible for us to aſſent to any thing as *a matter of Faith*, if we do not firſt *aſſent* to the *arguments, reaſons and words*, by which you would perſwade us to believe the thing to be declared by the *Church*, and what is declared by the *Church* is true. 8. Whether, when you ſay, *That in the Scripture every word and tittle is matter of Faith, at leaſt implicitely, and neceſſarily to be believed by all that knew it to be a part of Scripture*; this will not equally hold as to the *Church* too, that *every word and tittle, is matter of Faith, at leaſt implicitely to all that know it to be a part of the Churches Definition?* And where then lyes the prerogative of *Scripture* above the *Church?* Beſides, you tell us, *The Church hath certain limits, and can define nothing, but what was either revealed before, or hath ſuch connexion with it, as it may be rationally and logically deduced from it, as appertaining to the Declaration and Defence of that which was before revealed.* That herein you conſult much for the honour of the *Scripture* above the *Church*, will appear when you have anſwered theſe *Queries*. 1. When the belief and ſenſe of *Scripture* depend according to you, upon the *Churches* Teſtimony, Whether hath more limits, the *Church* or *Scripture?* For, whatever is in *Scripture*, muſt as to us have its *Authority* from the *Church*; and therefore your *Church* ſets what bounds ſhe pleaſes as to things revealed in Scripture. 2. Who ſhall be Judge, whether your *Church* define nothing but what was revealed before, when, according to you, we can have no aſſurance as to any *Divine Revelation*, but from the *Judgement* of your *Church?* 3. When your *Church* defines things to be *matters of Faith*, which we think are not only *not logically and rationally deduced from Scripture, but plainly repugnant to it*, How can we believe that ſhe doth not pretend to reveal ſomething which was not *revealed* before? 4. Is that *rational and logical deduction from Scripture* ſufficient to perſwade any rational man or no? If not, Why uſe you thoſe terms? if it be, What need your *Churches Definition*, in a thing that is obvious to any ones reaſon? 5. Muſt we believe your *Church abſolutely*, as to what is *rationally and logically deduced* from Scripture? If ſo, then, when ſhe declares her own *Infallibility*, we muſt believe that to be *rationally deduced*, becauſe ſhe declares it. 6. Doth your *Church* make uſe of *Logick* and *Reaſon* in her deductions? then, Why may not every one elſe? unleſs ſhe hath only the gift of *Logick* and *Reaſon*, which, I ſuppoſe, you will ſay, is but *in a manner, and after a ſort*.

Ibid.

Moreover, ſay you, *The Church hath the receiving and interpreting Scripture for its end; and conſequently is in that reſpect inferiour to it.* But, for *whoſe end* do you mean? the *Churches*, or the *Scriptures end?* If the *latter*; Shew us how any *end* of Scripture is attained by your *Churches interpretation*; if you mean the *Churches end*, I verily believe you, that your *Church* pretends to the receiving and interpreting *Scripture* for *her own ends*, and conſequently, in that reſpect, ſhe makes the *Scripture* inferiour to *her*.

P. 64.

Here again we meet with another piece of your *Errantry*, in attempting to vindicate your Doctrine from the *enchantment* of another *contradiction*. *You ſay, You hold it neceſſary, that we are to believe the Scriptures to be the Word of*

God

God upon divine Authority; and yet, you tell us, *That the Churches Authority, on which we are to believe the Scriptures is but in ſome ſort, and after a manner Divine.* This ſeems to have a huge reſemblance to a Contradiction; or elſe you muſt ſay, That it is not neceſſary that we believe the *Scriptures* on a *ſimply Divine Authority*, but only on ſuch a one as is *in ſome ſort*, and *after a manner Divine*: For, if you make the ſame Authority to be *Divine abſolutely* in your pretence, and only *after a ſort* in your Application, you reach not the thing you promiſed. If there be not, as you ſay, *any neceſſity of defending the Churches Authority to be ſimply Divine, in anſwering that Queſtion, How we know Scripture to be Scripture*, then there can be no neceſſity of aſſerting, that we are bound to believe the *Scriptures to be the Word of God upon Divine Authority?* Which yet is your aſſertion before; but yet you would fain diſtinguiſh *between that which is abſolutely infallible, and divine*; *the Churches Authority* (you ſay) *muſt be the former, but cannot be the latter*; when yet this Infallibility is, as you again tell us, *By the promiſed aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.* Theſe are fit hedges to keep in *Cuckows*, but none elſe.

But, as you are ſtill off and on, ſometimes ſeeming to go forward, and then §. 25.
ſtepping back again; ſometimes anſwering, ſometimes proving, which are great arguments of a diſturbed mind, or a being in a *Labyrinth*, which you take many ſteps in, but can find no way out of, leſt you ſhould ſeem not ſufficiently to contradict your ſelf: You go about to prove, *That the Authority, teaching Scripture to be the Word of God, muſt be abſolutely infallible*; If you prove that, I will undertake to prove it muſt *be ſimply Divine*: But, let us ſee however, how irrefragably you prove it. *And the immediate Reaſon,* P. 65. l. 8.
Why the Authority teaching Scripture to be the Word of God, muſt be abſolutely infallible, is, becauſe it is an Article of Chriſtian Faith, that all thoſe Books which the Church hath defined for Canonical Scripture, are the Word of God; and ſeeing every Article of Faith muſt be revealed, or taught by Divine Authority, this alſo muſt be revealed, and conſequently no Authority leſs than Divine, is ſufficient to move us to believe it as an Article of Faith. But 1. Is it not poſſible for you to utter ſo many words without a contradiction? Were you not juſt before diſtinguiſhing that Authority which is *Divine*, from that which is *abſolutely infallible*; and but *in a manner, and after a ſort Divine?* And yet here, that *Authority* which you call *abſolutely infallible*, in the former part of your Argument; in the laſt you explain it, *No Authority leſs than Divine*; Doth it not then follow, that an Authority *abſolutely infallible*, is an Authority *no leſs than Divine.* But to let that paſs among the reſt of his Brethren. 2. Why take you this needleſs pains to prove that which you ſay before, *You and your Adverſary are agreed in.* 3. Suppoſing you ſhould meet with ſome who ſhould queſtion this, as it is probable you may do before we part; I think it no difficult thing to anſwer this Argument of yours, which, in ſhort, is, *Every Article of Faith muſt be believed upon Divine Authority, but that the Scriptures are the Word of God, is an Article of Faith.* To which I anſwer, If by *an Article of Faith*, you mean, that we muſt give an *undoubted aſſent* to, then I grant, that this is *an Article of Faith*, but deny, that every ſuch *Article* muſt be believed upon *Divine Authority*; if by an *Article of Faith* you mean ſomething to be believed upon *Divine Teſtimony*, then I grant, that every ſuch *Article* muſt be built on *Divine Authority*, but ſhall deſire you to prove, that that *Faith* whereby I believe *Scripture to be Scripture*, muſt be built on a *Divine Teſtimony.* For, I cannot ſee, how any, who ſay ſo, can free themſelves from a *Circle*: and of all perſons, you have the leaſt reaſon to ſay ſo; for you deny the *Churches Teſtimony* to be properly *Divine*, and withal the Argument is very eaſily retorted upon your ſelf. For, ſay you, *whatſoever is an Article of Faith, muſt be believed on Divine Authority, but that the Church is infallible, I ſuppoſe, to you is an Article of Faith*: Name there-

fore what Divine Authority the belief of that is built upon? But, Do not you ſay, the belief of that is built on the *Motives of Credibility*, and, I ſuppoſe, you diſtinguiſh them from *Divine Authority*, or elſe they can do you no ſervice for avoiding the *Circle:* Either therefore deny that *your Churches Infallibility* is *an Article of Faith*, or elſe deny it to be neceſſary, that *every Article of Faith*, muſt be built on *Divine Authority*, and then farewel your *old friends* the *Motives* of Credibility; or elſe, you ſee, how neceſſary it is for you, if you will vindicate your ſelf from contradiction, to anſwer this Argument; and when you have done ſo, you will believe I did not much dread the force of it. The reſt of that Paragraph, is a bare Repetition, the fourth or fifth time, of your diſtinction about the *Formal Object of Faith*, and
P. 64. n. 6. the *infallible Aſſurance* of it, which is a thing in it ſelf ſo incongruous, and unreaſonable, that I had thoughts mean enough of you, when I met with it firſt; but have much meaner, now I meet with it ſo often, for I ſee, as pitiful a ſhift as it is, you have no other to make uſe of on all occaſions.

His Lordſhip goes on to prove that, ſince it is confeſſed between him and his Adverſary, *That we muſt be able to prove the Scriptures to be the Word of God, by ſome Authority that is abſolutely Divine; this Authority cannot be that*
P. 65. *of the Church. For the Church conſiſts of men ſubject to errour; and all the parts being liable to miſtaking, and fallible, the whole cannot poſſibly be infallible in and of it ſelf, and privileged from being deceived in ſome things or other.* To this you anſwer, *His Lordſhip's Argument (that the whole may err, becauſe every part may err) is diſproved by himſelf, becauſe in Fundamentals he grants the whole Church cannot err, and yet that any particular man may err even in thoſe points.* But, is it not plain, that his Lordſhips deſign is to prove, that if all the *parts are fallible*, the Authority of the *whole* cannot be *ſimply Divine?* and therefore he ſaith himſelf, that in *Fundamentals*, in which the *Univerſal Church* cannot err, her Authority is *not Divine*, becauſe the *Church* is tyed to the uſe of means. You muſt therefore prove, that when every *part* is acknowledged *fallible*, the Authority of the *whole* in propounding any thing to be believed, can be *infallible* in and of it ſelf: I cannot therefore underſtand, how the perfection of Infallibility in the propoſition of any Object to be believed, can be applied to the whole Church, when every particular
P. 65. member of it in ſuch a *Propoſition* is ſuppoſed to be fallible. *The Arch-Biſhop therefore tells you, That there is ſpecial immediate Revelation requiſite to the very leaſt degree of Divine Authority*; to avoid which, *you would fain prove, that there may be abſolute Infallibility, without Divine Authority, and immediate Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, in delivering Objects of Faith, without immediate Revelation.* You tell us therefore, *Though the Church uſe means, yet ſhe receives not her Infallibility from them, but from the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, which makes her Definitions truly infallible, though they be not new Revelations.* But, How do you prove, that any thing but an *immediate Divine Revelation* can make ſuch a *Divine Teſtimony* which is ſuppoſed neceſſary for the *belief of Scripture to be Scripture?* How can you make it appear, that there can be *Infallibility* in the *Concluſion*, where there was not *Infallibility* in judging of the *Truth* of the *Premiſes?* You ſay, *By the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.* But why ſhould you not believe ſuch an Aſſiſtance in the *one*, as well as the *other?* If therefore you aſſert, that the *Spirit of God* doth not aſſiſt infallibly in the *uſe of the means*, but only in the *concluſion*, then it muſt be an *immediate Revelation*; for what elſe it ſhould be, is not intelligible. For, I had thought the *Revelation* had been *immediate*, when ſomewhat more was diſcovered than all *uſe of means* could attain to: therefore the Churches *Infallibility* muſt be a meer *Enthuſiaſm.* No, ſay you, *Becauſe it only declares what was formerly revealed.* Though that be a Queſtion among ſome of your ſelves; yet, ſuppoſing it to be ſo, it clears not the buſineſs.

For,

For, ſuppoſe that *God* had *ſupernaturally aſſiſted* the *Underſtanding* of any *Prophet* in declaring a Prophecy which had been revealed before, Would not this have been as immediate a *Revelation* to that *Prophet*, as if it had been a *New Prophecy?* And the caſe is the ſame here; for, though you ſay, the *Material Objects of Faith* be revealed before, yet we cannot know the *Formal Object of Faith*, without your *Churches* declaration, ſo that on your Principles there cannot lye an Obligation to Faith on us, without your *Churches Definition*; and therefore that is as neceſſary *to us*, as immediate Revelation; and to the *Church it ſelf*, when you ſay, *The Infallibility proceeds ſo immediately from God, that if the Church ſhould fall into errour, that would be aſcribed to God as much as in caſe of Divine Revelation*, What difference can you make between them? For, it is not, Whether the *Object* be new or old, which makes an *immediate Revelation*; but the *immediate Impreſſion* of it on the underſtanding. For if the *Spirit of God* doth immediately diſcover to any one, a thing knowable by natural cauſes, is it any thing the leſs an immediate Divine Revelation? So it muſt be in things already revealed, if the ſame *things* be diſcovered in an *immediate infallible manner* to the mind of any, the Revelation is as immediate as if they had never been revealed before.

Your laſt *Paragraph* affords us ſtill more evidence of your *ſelf-contradicting* faculty; for which we need no more than lay your words together. Your words next before were, *If the Church ſhould fall into errour, it would be as much aſcribed to God himſelf, as in caſe of immediate Divine Revelation*; but here you add; *Neither is it neceſſary for us to affirm, that the Definition of the Church, is Gods immediate Revelation; as, if the Definition were falſe, Gods Revelation muſt be alſo ſuch: It is enough for us to aver, that Gods Promiſe would be infringed, as truly it would in that Suppoſition.* From which we may learn very uſeful inſtructions. 1. That *Gods Promiſe* may be *infringed*, and yet *Gods Revelation* not proved to be *falſe*: But whence came that Promiſe? Was it not a *Divine Revelation?* if it was undoubtedly ſuch, Can ſuch a Promiſe be falſe, and not *Gods Revelation?* 2. That though if the *Church err*, *God* muſt be *fallible*, yet for all this, all *Gods Revelations* may remain *infallible*. 3. That though the only ground of *Infallibility be the immediate Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*, which gives as great an *Infallibility*, as ever was in *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*; yet we muſt not ſay, That ſuch an Infallibility doth ſuppoſe an *immediate Revelation*. 4. That though *Gods Veracity* would be deſtroyed, if the *Church* ſhould define any thing for a point of *Catholick Faith*, which were not revealed from *God*, which are your next words; yet we are not to think, if her Definition be falſe, *Gods Revelation* muſt be alſo ſuch, which are your words foregoing. Thoſe are excellent *Corollaries* to conclude ſo profound a diſcourſe with. And, *if the Biſhop* (as you ſay) *had little reaſon to accuſe you for maintaining a party*; I am ſure, I have leſs to admire you, for *your ſeeking Truth*; *and whatever animoſity you are led by*, I hope I have made it evident, *you are led by very little reaſon.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Infallibility of Tradition.

Of the unwritten Word, and the neceſſary Ingredients of it. The Inſtances for it particularly examined and diſproved. The Fathers Rule for examining Traditions. No unwritten Word the Foundation of Divine Faith. In what ſenſe Faith may be ſaid to be Divine. Of Tradition being known by its own light, and the Canon of the Scripture. The Teſtimony of the Spirit, how far pertinent to this Controverſie. Of the uſe of reaſon in the reſolution of Faith. T. C.'s *Dialogue anſwered, with another between himſelf and a Sceptick. A twofold reſolution of Faith, into the Doctrine, and into the Books. Several Objections anſwered from the Suppoſition made of a Child brought up without ſight of Scripture. Chriſt no Ignoramus nor Impoſtor though the Church be not infallible.* T. C.'s *Blaſphemy in ſaying otherwiſe. The Teſtimonies of* Irenæus *and S.* Auguſtin *examined and retorted. Of the nature of infallible Certainty, as to the Canon of Scripture; and whereon it is grounded. The Teſtimonies produced by his Lordſhip vindicated.*

§. 1. YOu begin this *Chapter* with as much confidence, as if you had ſpoken nothing but *Oracles* in the foregoing. *Whether the Biſhop or you were more hardly put to it*, let any indifferent Reader judge: If he did, as you ſay, *tread on the brink of a Circle*; we have made it appear, notwithſtanding all your evaſions, that you are left in the middle of it. The reaſon of his falling on the unwritten Word, *is not his fear of ſtooping to the Church, to ſhew it him, and finally depend on her Authority*; but to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of your proceedings, who talk much of an unwritten Word, and are not able to prove any ſuch thing. *If he will not believe any unwritten Word, but what is ſhewn him delivered by the Prophets and Apoſtles*, I think he hath a great deal of reaſon for ſuch incredulity, unleſs you could ſhew him ſome aſſurance of any unwritten Word, that did not come from the *Apoſtles*. Though he deſired *not to read unwritten Words in their Books*, which is a wiſe Queſtion you ask; yet he reaſonably requeſted ſome certain evidence of what you pretend to be ſo, that he might not have ſo big a Faith as to ſwallow into his belief, that every thing which his adverſary ſays is the *unwritten Word*, is ſo indeed. *If it be not your deſire he ſhould*, we have the greater hopes of ſatisfaction from you; but if you crave *the indifferent Readers Patience, till he hear reaſon from you*, I am afraid his patience will be tryed, before you come to it. But, whatever it is, it muſt be examined.

Though your diſcourſe concerning this *unwritten Word*, be as the reſt are, very confuſed and immethodical, yet I conceive the deſign and ſubſtance of it lyes in theſe particulars, as will appear in the examination of them.

1. That there is an unwritten Word, which muſt be believed by us, containing ſuch doctrinal Traditions, as are warranted by the *Church* for *Apoſtolical*.

2. That the ground of believing this unwritten Word, is from the Infallibility of the *Church*, which defines it to be ſo.

3. That our belief of the *Scriptures* muſt be grounded on ſuch an unwritten Word, which is warranted by the Church: under each of theſe I ſhall examine faithfully what belongs to them in your indigeſted diſcourſe.

The

The first of these is taken from your own words; where you tell us, *That our Ensurancer in the main Principle of Faith concerning the Scriptures being the Word of God, is Apostolical Tradition; and well may it be so, for such Tradition declared by the Church, is the unwritten Word of God.* And you after tell us, *That every Doctrine, which any particular person may please to call Tradition, is not therefore to be received as Gods unwritten Word; but such doctrinal Traditions only, as are warranted to us by the Church for truly Apostolical, which are consequently Gods unwritten Word.* So that these three things are necessary ingredients of this unwritten Word. 1. That it must be *originally Apostolical*, and not only so, but it must be of *Divine Revelation to the Apostles* too. For otherwise it cannot be *Gods Word* at all, and therefore not his *unwritten Word*. I quarrel not at all with you for speaking of an *unwritten Word*, if you could prove it; for it is evident to me, that *Gods Word* is no more so, by being written or printed, than if it were not so: for the writing adds no Authority to the *Word*, but only is a more certain means of conveying it to us. It is therefore *Gods Word*, as it proceeds from him; and that which is now his *written Word*, was once his *unwritten Word*: but however, whatever is *Gods Word*, must come from him, and since you derive the source of the *unwritten Word* from the *Apostles*, whatever you call an *unwritten word*, you must be sure to derive its pedigree down from them. So that insisting on that point of time, when this was declared and owned for an *unwritten Word*, you must be able to shew, that it came from the *Apostles*, otherwise it cannot be owned as an *Apostolical Tradition*. 2. That what you call an *unwritten word*, must be something *doctrinal*; so you call *them* your self *doctrinal Traditions*, *i. e.* such as contain in them somewhat *dogmatical* or necessary to be believed by us: and thence it was, this Controversie rose from the Dispute concerning the sufficiency of the *Scriptures*, as a *Rule of Faith*, Whether that contained all *Gods Word*, or all matters to be believed or no; or, Whether there were not some Objects of Faith, which were never written, but conveyed by Tradition? 3. That what is thus *doctrinal*, must be declared by the Church to be an *Apostolical Tradition*; which you in terms assert. P. 66. ch. 6. n. 1.

According then to these Rules we come to examine the Evidences by you produced for such an *unwritten Word*. For which, you first produce several Instances out of S. *Austin*, *of such things which were in his time judged to be such*, i. e. *doctrinal Traditions derived from the Apostles, and have ever since been conserved and esteemed such in the whole Church of Christ.* The first you instance in, is that we now treat of, *That Scripture is the Word of God*, for which you propose the known place wherein he affirms *he should not believe the Gospel, but for the Authority of the Church moving him thereto.* But this proves nothing to your purpose, unless you make it appear, that the *Authority of the Church* could not move him *to believe the Gospel*, unless that Authority be supposed to be an *unwritten Word*. For, I will suppose, that S. *Austin*, or any other rational man might be sufficiently induced to believe the *Gospel*, on the account of the *Churches* Authority, not as delivering any *doctrinal Tradition* in the nature of an unwritten *Word*, but as attesting that *Universal Tradition*, which had been among all *Christians* concerning it. Which Universal Tradition is nothing else but a conveying down to us the judgement of *sense and reason* in the present case. For the Primitive *Christians* being best able to judge as to what Authentick Writings came from the *Apostles*, not by any unwritten Word, but by the use of all moral means, it cannot reasonably be supposed, that the successive Christians should imbezzle these Authentick Records, and substitute others in the place of them. When therefore *Manichæus* pretended the Authenticalness of some other writings, besides those then owned by §. 2. *Ep. fund. c. 5.*

the

the *Church*, S. *Auſtin* did no more than any reaſonable man would do in the like caſe, *viz.* appeal to the *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Catholick Church*; upon the account of which, he ſays, He was induced to believe the Goſpel it ſelf, *i.e.* not ſo much the *Doctrine*, as the *Books* containing it. But of this more largely elſewhere. I can hardly excuſe you from a falſification of S. *Auſtin*'s meaning, in the enſuing words, which you thus render: *If any clear Teſtimony were brought out of Scripture againſt the Church, he would neither believe the Scripture, nor the Church*; whereas it appears by the words cited in your own Margin, his meaning is only this, *If you can find* (ſaith he) *ſomething very plain in the Goſpel concerning the Apoſtleſhip of* Manichæus, *you will thereby weaken the Authority of thoſe Catholicks, who bid me, that I ſhould not believe you; whoſe Authority being weakned, neither can I believe the Goſpel, becauſe, through them, I believed it.* Is here any thing like what you ſaid, or at leaſt would ſeem to have apprehended to be his meaning? which is plainly this. *If againſt the conſent of all thoſe Copies which the Catholick Chriſtians received, thoſe Copies ſhould be found truer, which have in them ſomething of the Apoſtleſhip of* Manichæus; *this muſt needs weaken much the Authority of the Catholick Church in its Tradition, whom he adhered to againſt the* Manichees; *and their Authority being thus weakned, his Faith, as to the Scriptures delivered by them, muſt needs be much weakned too.* To give you an Inſtance of a like nature; The *Mahumetans* pretend, that in the Scripture there was anciently expreſs mention of their Prophet *Mahomet*, but that the *Chriſtians*, out of hatred of their Religion, have eraſed all thoſe places which ſpake of him: Suppoſe now, a *Chriſtian* ſhould ſay, If he ſhould find in the *Goſpel* expreſs mention of *Mahomet*'s being a Prophet, it would much weaken the Authority of the whole *Chriſtian Church*; which being ſo weakned, it muſt of neceſſity weaken the Faith of all thoſe who have believed our preſent Copies Authentick, upon the account of the Chriſtian Churches Authority. Is not this plainly the caſe S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of; and, Is it any more than any mans reaſon will tell him? Not that the Churches Authority is to be relyed on as judicially or infallibly, but as rationally, delivering ſuch an Univerſal Tradition to us. And, might not S. *Auſtin*, on the ſame reaſon, *as well believe the Acts of the Apoſtles as the Goſpel*, when they were both equally delivered by the ſame Univerſal Tradition? What you have gained then to your purpoſe from theſe three citations out of S. *Auſtin*, in your firſt Inſtance, I cannot eaſily imagine.

Ibid.

§. 3. Your ſecond Tradition is, That the Father is not begotten of any other perſon. S. *Auſtin*'s words are, *Sicut Patrem in illis libris nuſquam Ingenitum legimus, & tamen dicendum eſſe defenditur. We never read in the Scriptures, that the Father is unbegotten; and yet it is defended, that we muſt ſay ſo.* And had they not good reaſon with them to ſay ſo, who believed that he was the *Father* by way of excluſion of ſuch a kind of *Generation* as the Eternal *Son* of *God* is ſuppoſed to have? But, Muſt this be an Inſtance of a doctrinal Tradition, containing ſome *Object* of *Faith* diſtinct from Scripture? Could any one, whoever believed the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as revealed in Scripture, believe or imagine any other? that though it be not in expreſs terms ſet down in Scripture, yet no one that hath any conceptions of the Father, but this is implied in them. If it be therefore a Tradition, becauſe it is not expreſly in Scripture, Why may not *Trinity*, *Hypoſtaſis*, *Perſon*, *Conſubſtantiality*, be all *unwritten Traditions* as well as this? You will ſay, Becauſe, though the words be not there, yet the ſenſe is: and I pray, take the ſame Anſwer for this of the *Fathers being unbegotten.*

Tom. 2. ep. 114.

Your third is, *Of the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin* Mary: This indeed, S. *Auſtin* ſaith, is to be believed *fide integra*, but he ſaith not, *divinâ*; but,

Do

Do you therefore make this a *doctrinal Tradition*, and an *unwritten Word*? If you make it a *doctrinal Tradition*, you muſt ſhew us, what *Article of Faith* is contained in it. That it was not looked on as an *unwritten Word*, will appear by the diſputations of thoſe *Fathers*, who writ moſt eagerly about it, who make it their deſign to prove it out of *Scripture*. Thoſe who did moſt zealouſly appear againſt the Opinion of *Helvidius*, were S. *Hierom*, and S. *Ambroſe*, of the *Latin Church*, S. *Auſtin* only mentions it in the places by you cited: Of the *Greek Church Epiphanius*, and S. *Baſil*. And yet every one of theſe contends to have it proved out of Scripture. S. *Hierom* enters his diſpute againſt *Helvidius* upon thoſe terms of confuting him out of *Scripture*; and towards the concluſion of that diſcourſe, ſee what a friend S. *Hierom* is to *doctrinal Traditions*. *As*, ſaith he, *we deny not the things which are written, ſo we embrace not the things which are not written. We believe the Incarnation, becauſe we read it; we believe not the Marriage of* Mary *after her delivery, becauſe we read it not.* S. *Ambroſe*, in his Epiſtle to *Theophilus* and *Anyſius*, where he firſt mentions this Opinion, argues againſt it wholly from the *Teſtimony of Scripture*; and the unreaſonableneſs of the thing. To the ſame purpoſe *Epiphanius* diſcourſeth of this ſubject, whoſe utmoſt Arguments are only probabilities; Whether the *Antidicomariani* were the ſame with *Helvidians*, as S. *Auſtin* ſuppoſeth: Or, Whether they were the Diſciples of *Apollinarius*, who broached the ſame Doctrine in the *Eaſt*, at the time *Helvidius* did in the *Weſt*, as others ſuppoſe is not material to our purpoſe; but this later ſeems to be the Opinion of *Epiphanius*: Who in his Epiſtle, written in Confutation of that Opinion, chargeth the firſt Authors of it with great Ignorance of the Scriptures, and urgeth many places to prove the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*; and therefore did not look on it as an unwritten Word. S. *Baſil*, in his diſcourſe concerning *the Humane Generation of Chriſt*, falls upon this Subject, and goes about to prove it from the importance of ἕως ὅ *which* (ſaith he) *although it ſeems to ſpeak ſome circumſcription of time, yet it really denotes* τὸ ἀόριστον, *an indefinite time, as in that, I will be with you alwaies to the end of the world.* But he uſhers in this diſcourſe with this remarkable Expreſſion; *Although this be no hindrance to the Doctrine of Piety; for till the Oeconomy of her delivery was accompliſhed, her Virginity was neceſſary; but what became of it afterwards is not pertinent to this myſtery: however, becauſe the ears of thoſe who love Chriſt, will hardly entertain this, that* Mary *ceaſed to be a Virgin, we ſuppoſe theſe proofs ſufficient for it.* Judge then whether S. *Baſil* did believe this to be a Doctrine of Faith, or an unwritten word. This Teſtimony *Fronto Ducæus*, is much troubled with, and would go about to prove this to be an Article of Faith, from the *Councils* of *Conſtantinople and the Lateran*; in the firſt of which ſhe is only called ἀειπαρθένος. But doth that note it to be an Article of Faith? As for his evaſion of this Teſtimony, it is ſo impertinent, that I ſhall not repeat it, although he voucheth *Vaſquez* for the Author of it. It cannot be denied, but that afterwards S. *Baſil* produceth a Tradition for it concerning *Zachary*'s placing the *Virgin Mary* after her delivery, among the *Virgins*, for which he was ſlain of the *Jews*, between the Temple and the Altar. But, we may gueſs at the credit of this Tradition, by what S. *Hierom* ſaith of it, that it came *ex Apocryphorum ſomniis*, and withal, gives a ſufficient laſh at all Traditions, by reaſon of this, in the next words. *Hoc quia*

Ipſa Scripturarum verba ponenda ſunt ut ipſis quibus adverſum nos uſus eſt teſtimoniis revincatur. Adverſ. Helv. prim.

Sed ut hæc quæ ſcripta ſunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non ſunt ſcripta venimus: Natum Deum eſſe de Virgine credimus, quia legimus; Mariam nupſiſſe poſt partum, non credimus quia non legimus. Hieron. adverſ. Helv. To. 2. p. 6. col. 1. ed. P. 1533.

V. Ambroſ. Tom. 3. ep. 9. Baſil. 1555.

Epiphan. hæreſ. 78. Tom. 1. l. 3. edit. Petav.

Aug. de hæreſ. 84.

V. Vaſquez in 3. p. *Thom. tom.* 2. *diſp.* 121. *c.* 6.

Epiph. hæreſ. 78. *ſect.* 7. *p.* 1038.

Homil. 25. *p.* 509. *Tom.* 1.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ εἰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας πάντα λυμαίνεται λόγου (μέχρι γὰρ τῆς τοῦ οἰκονομίαν παρθενία ἀναγκαία ἡ παρθενία, τὸ δὲ ἐφεξῆς ἀπαραγμόνητον τῷ λόγῳ τὸ μυστήριον καταλείπομεν) ὅμως διὰ τὸ μὴ καταδέχεσθαι τῶν φιλοχρίστων τὰς ἀκοὰς, ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένος ἡ θεοτόκος, ἐκείνας ἡγούμεθα τὰς μαρτυρίας ἀπαρκεῖς. Ibid.

Not. in Baſil. To. 3. *p.* 49. *ed. Pariſ.* 1638.

Comment. in Matth. 23. *Tom.* 9.

quia de Scripturis non habet auctoritatem, eâdem facilitate contemnitur, quâ probatur. Which having no Authority from the Scriptures, it is as easily contemned as produced. And think you not then, that S. *Hierom* was a great friend to your doctrinal Traditions, and unwritten Word? But, say you still, *The Virginity of* Mary *must be an Article of Faith, because, those who denied it are called Hereticks; and S.* Augustine *calls* Helvidius *his Opinion, blasphemy.* But, though *Helvidius* be listed among the *Hereticks*, yet, I suppose, you will not say that all who are listed in those *Catalogues* are defined to be *Hereticks* by the *Catholick Church?* It is very apparent, that any one who seemed to broach any new fancies, and thereby disturbed the *Churches Peace*, were called *Hereticks* by them. And *Vasquez* confesseth that *Aquinas* calls it an *Error*, and not an *Heresie* in *Helvidius*. If it were so, he was not the first Author of it; for, *Tertullian* is not only cited by *Helvidius* for it, and S. *Hierom* casts away his Testimony, as of a man out of the *Church*, but *Vasquez* confesseth he delivers it so often, that *Pamelius* could make no *antidote* for those places. One would therefore think, that one so near the *Apostles* as *Tertullian* was, might easily have learned such a Tradition, and so great a friend to *Virginity* as he was (while a *Montanist*) should not have been apt to believe the contrary. That which was accounted *Blasphemy* in *Helvidius*, was the rashness of his assertion, which seemed dishonourable to the *Blessed Virgin*, and not as though he did thereby overthrow any Article of Faith. For the other part of your Tradition, that she was a *Virgin* in the *Birth* of *Christ*, you will find it a greater difficulty to make it out to have been believed as a *Tradition*, much less as an unwritten Word For not only *Tertullian*, but *Ignatius*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Epiphanius*, *Ambrose*, *Theophylact* oppose you in it; and judge you then, whether this were owned as a constant Tradition or no. But it is not worth while to insist upon it.

ubi supra.

In 3. p. Thom. tom. 2. q. 28. art. 3. cap. 7.

§. 4. Your fourth Instance is, concerning *the Rebaptization of Hereticks*. Concerning which, two things are to be considered, *The Custom it self*, and the *Right* and *Law* on which that Custom was grounded. In the places by you cited out of S. *Austin*, it is plain, he speaks of the Custome and Practice of the *Church*, which (saith he) did not use the *Iteration of Baptism, which Custome, he believed, did come from Apostolical Tradition; as many other things which are not found in the writings of the Apostles, nor in following Councils, yet because they are observed by the Universal Church, are believed to be delivered, and commended by them.* To the same purpose is the other Testimony. But what is this to *doctrinal Traditions, concerning matters of Faith?* That there were many *Ecclesiastical Customs* observed in the *Church* as *Apostolical Traditions*, I deny not, but that is not our present Question. If you therefore enquire into that which is only *doctrinal* in this case concerning the *right* and lawfulness of Practice in this case, that he fixeth wholly upon the Scriptures. The Practice of the *Church* in admitting *Hereticks* without baptizing them again, might be known by *Tradition*, but whether the Church did well or ill in it, must be by S. *Austin*'s own confession determined out of *Scripture*. And in that later place by you cited, there is mentioned no such thing as an unwritten Word, or that the *Apostles* had left any command that *Hereticks* should not be baptized again. *Nihil quidem exinde præceperunt Apostoli*, are his own words; there being then neither written nor unwritten *Word* for it, S. *Austin* takes the likeliest course he could think of, which was, from the Custom of the *Church*, to judge most probably what was most agreeable to the *Apostles* minds. But still, when he comes to urge most home against the *Donatists*, he makes his recourse to the *Scriptures*. And offers to prove the *matter in dispute from them, and would have all tryed by the ballance of the Lord.*

Contra Donatist. l. 2. c. 7.

Ex Evangelio profero certa documenta. l. 1. c. Donatist. cap. 6.

And

And expreſly ſaith, *It is againſt the Lords command, that thoſe who have had lawful Baptiſm already, ſhould be rebaptized.* So that we ſee, S. *Auguſtine* did not himſelf think it a ſufficient proof of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, that it was a Cuſtom of the *Church*, unleſs he did likewiſe produce certain evidence out of *Scripture* for the confirmation of it. Neither then will your fourth Inſtance prove what it was brought for.

Quid ſit pernicioſius, utrum non baptizari an rebaptizari, judicare difficile eſt, veruntamen recurrens ad illam ſtateram re Domini ſententiam, nempe in Scripturis. l. 2. c. 14. *Hoc accedit quia benè perſpectis ex utroque latere diſputationis rationibus, & Scripturarum Teſtimoniis, poteſt etiam dici, Quod veritas declaravit hoc ſequimur.* l. 4. c. 7. vid. l. 4. c. 24. l. 5. c. 4. l. 6. c. 1. l. 5. c. 23 c. 26. *Dominicam, ubi non ex humano ſenſu ſed ex divinâ auctoritate verum momenta penſantur, invenio de utrâque*

Your fifth concerning *Infants Baptiſm*, you have given us occaſion to conſider largely already; your ſixth depends upon that; your ſeventh is only a rite of the Church. To your eighth I anſwer, Though the Tradition of the Church be a great confirmation of the *Apoſtolical Practice* in obſervation of the *Lords day*, yet that very Practice, and the ground of it, are ſufficiently deduced from *Scripture*. Among all theſe Inſtances therefore, we are yet to ſeek for ſuch a *doctrinal Tradition*, as makes an *unwritten Word*. But, methinks an Author, who would ſeem ſo much verſed in S. *Auguſtine*, might, among all theſe Inſtances, have found out one more, which would have looked more like a *doctrinal Tradition*, than moſt of theſe, which is, the *neceſſity of the Euchariſt to baptized Infants*: The places are ſo many, and ſo expreſs in him concerning it, that it would be a needleſs task to produce them. I ſhall only therefore refer you to your *Eſpencæus*, who hath made ſome collection of them. When you have viewed them, I pray bethink your ſelf of ſome convenient Anſwer to them, which either muſt be by aſſerting, that S *Auguſtine* might be deceived in judging of *Doctrinal* and *Apoſtolical Traditions*; and then to what purpoſe are your eight Inſtances out of him? Or elſe that might be accounted an *Apoſtolical Tradition* in one *age*, which may not in another; and then, ſince, according to your judgement, the *preſent Church is infallible in every age*, that was *infallibly* an *Apoſtolical Tradition* in one age, which infallibly is *not ſo* in another. Which leaves us in a greater diſpute than ever, what theſe *Apoſtolical Traditions* are, when the *Church* in ſeveral ages doth ſo much differ concerning them.

Eſpenc. de Euchariſt. ad Orat. l. 2. c. 12.

§. 5.

After you have, in your way, attempted to prove ſuch *unwritten Words*, or *doctrinal Traditions*, you fall upon a high charge againſt his Lordſhip, and not without a ſevere reflection on all *Proteſtants*, in theſe words. *It is ſo natural to Proteſtants to build upon falſe grounds, that they cannot enter into a Queſtion, without ſuppoſing a falſhood; ſo his Lordſhip here feeds his humour, and obtrudes many.* It is well yet his Lordſhip meets with no worſe entertainment than all *Proteſtants* do: You think all *Proteſtants* ſtill build upon falſe grounds, becauſe not *ſupra hanc Petram*, and that they ſtill ſuppoſe falſhoods, becauſe they ſuppoſe your *Church fallible*, whether ſhe undertakes to explain written, or define unwritten Words. But, whether his Lordſhip feeds his humour in obtruding falſhoods, or you yours in calumniating, will appear upon examination. You ſay, *He makes* Bellarmine, *and all Catholick Doctors, maintain, that whatever they pleaſe to call Tradition, muſt preſently be received by all as God's unwritten Word.* Upon which you go about to vindicate *Bellarmine*, by repeating his diſtinctions concerning Traditions, *viz. That ſome are Divine, others Apoſtolical, and others Eccleſiaſtical, and that ſome belong to Faith, others to Manners.* But all this doth not ſerve your turn. For 1. His Lordſhip doth not deny, that *Bellarmine* uſeth theſe diſtinctions, but reduceth all theſe ſeveral Traditions under the ſame common title *de Verbo Dei non ſcripto*; and that his deſign therein, is to impoſe upon unwary Readers, that all the Tra-

P. 68.

ditions mentioned by him, are *God's unwritten Word.* Upon which, his Lordſhip had good reaſon to go about to undeceive them, and to make it appear ſo evidently as he hath done, that *Tradition*, and *God's unwritten Word*, are not convertible terms; both becauſe there may be juſtly ſuppoſed to have been many *unwritten Words*, which were never delivered over to the *Church*; and that there are many things which go for *Traditions* in your *Church*, which have no ſhadow of pretence from an *unwritten Word.* 2. There may be yet further cunning in all this; for, although *Bellarmine* and you diſtinguiſh of *Traditions, Divine, Apoſtolical* and *Eccleſiaſtical*; yet when you come to put the difference between theſe, I ſuppoſe you would not leave it to every particular *perſon*, to judge which of theſe *Traditions* is of theſe ſeveral natures, but the *Church* muſt be judge of them. So that a Tradition is *Eccleſiaſtical*, when your *Church* will have it ſo, that is, when it is diſuſed among you, as the *three dippings in Baptiſm*, the *participation of Euchariſts by Infants*, &c. But when any Tradition is ſtill in *uſe* by your *Church*, then your *Churches Practice* being in this caſe a ſufficient Definition as to all thoſe things ſo uſed by your *Church*, they muſt be accounted *Apoſtolical*, if not *Divine.* 3. Of what kind or nature ſoever theſe *Traditions* are ſuppoſed to be, whether *Divine, Apoſtolical*, or *Eccleſiaſtical*, prove any of them to contain any thing *neceſſary for Faith* and *Salvation*, and you will then come near an *unwritten Word.* Your *Eccleſiaſtical Traditions* you diſcard your ſelf from being ſuch, inform us then what *Divine* and *Apoſtolical Traditions* thoſe are which are founded on ſuch an unwritten Word? Whether any of your *Eccleſiaſtical Traditions* contradict *God's Word*, or no, is not here a place to examine; we are now enquiring, Whether there be any ſuch thing as an *unwritten Word* at all, which contains any matter neceſſary for us to believe, or practiſe. The only pretence you have here for it, is, *That we believe by Divine Faith, that Scripture is God's Word, and that there is no other Word of God to aſſure us of this Point, but the Tradition delivered to us by the Church, and that ſuch Tradition ſo delivered, muſt be the unwritten Word of God.* How far we are to believe *Scriptures* to be the *Word of God*, with *Divine Faith*, will be throughly examined in its due time; and likewiſe how far any *Word of God* is neceſſary for the Foundation of this *Faith*: only I cannot here but take notice, what it is which makes a Tradition be the *unwritten Word of God*; and what becomes then of your former diſtinction concerning *Traditions?* for we ſee, that which makes them the *Word of God*, is their being delivered by the *Church*; ſo that let their Author, Nature, or Matter be what it will, according to this Principle any *Tradition* being delivered by your *Church*, becomes an *unwritten Word.* So I come to the ſecond Propoſition.

§. 6. P. 58. n. 2. 2. *That the ground of believing any unwritten word, is the Infallibility of your Church defining it to be ſo.* For you ſay, *As the Church was Infallible in defining what was written, ſo is ſhe alſo infallible in defining what was not written. And ſo ſhe can neither* tradere non traditum, *nor can ſhe be unfaithful to God, in not faithfully keeping the* depoſitum *committed to her truſt: Neither can her Sons ever juſtly accuſe her of the contrary, but are bound to believe her Tradition, becauſe ſhe being infallible, the Tradition ſhe delivers can never be againſt the Word of their Father.* The ſubſtance of all which, is that which I laid down as your Propoſition, *That the ground of believing any Tradition to be Apoſtolical, or any unwritten word, is your Churches Infallibility in defining it to be ſo.* Which being built on a Principle, I have already manifeſted to be ſo fallacious and uncertain, I might without further trouble, quit my hands of it: but I ſhall, however, ſhew how inconſiſtent this is with the Rules of the *Ancients*, for diſcerning when *Traditions* are *Apoſtolical*, and when not. The great Rule we meet with among the

the Ancients for judging *Apoſtolical* Traditions, is that of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, *In ipſâ item Catholicâ Eccleſiâ magnoperè curandum eſt, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod ſemper, quod ab omnibus creditum eſt: hoc eſt enim verè proprieque Catholicum.* If this be a certain Rule to judge of *Catholick* and *Apoſtolical Traditions by*, viz. *That which hath been held every where, always, and by all*; then the judgement of *your Church* cannot be the infallible definer of *Apoſtolical Traditions*, unleſs you will ſuppoſe that your *Church* only can tell us, what was held *every where, always, and by all*: And if your *Church* alone can infallibly determine what Traditions are *Apoſtolical*, to what purpoſe ſhould we be put to ſuch a *Wild-gooſe chaſe*, to enquire *Univerſality*, *Antiquity* and *Conſent* in all things which pretend to be Traditions? But to any reaſonable man, as to any thing which pretends to be a matter neceſſary to be believed or practiſed, which is not expreſly revealed in *Scripture*; this Rule of *Vincentius* ſeems very juſt and equitable, that before we believe it neceſſary, it be made appear, that it was univerſally believed by *Chriſtians* to be ſo, and that in all ages And I aſſure you, I am ſo far convinced of the reaſonableneſs of this propoſal, that if you will make out any of thoſe things controverted between us, ſuch as *Invocation of Saints*, *Worſhip of Images*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Adoration of the Euchariſt*, *Purgatory*, *Indulgences*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, &c. by theſe Rules, and make it appear to me, that theſe were held by all *Chriſtian Churches*, *at all times*, or have *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent*; I ſhall be very inclinable to embrace what your *Church* would impoſe upon me. But when I know how impoſſible a task this is, I do not at all wonder that you ſhould quit this formerly magnified ſaying of *Vincentius*, and reſolve all into the Infallibility of the preſent *Church*. But hereby we ſee, how far you are from the judgement of *Antiquity*, as to this very point of the tryal of *doctrinal Traditions*, ſince you can ſee no ſecurity any where but in your ſelves, and your *Churches Infallibility*; I will therefore reduce the Controverſie yet ſhorter: prove but this *Infallibility of your Church in defining the written and unwritten Word* by theſe Rules of *Vincentius*, *Univerſality*, *Antiquity and Conſent*, and I will yield you all the reſt. But what unreaſonable men are you, if you muſt be Parties and Judges too; or if we muſt believe an *unwritten Word*, becauſe your *Church* is *infallible*; and believe your *Church Infallible*, becauſe that is an *unwritten Word?* And well may you call it ſo; for, ſearch the whole Book of *Scriptures*, and all the Records of the Primitive *Church*, and you find nothing at all of it. We ſee plainly then, you are reſolved to be tryed by none but your ſelves, and ſo you are *Catholicks*, becauſe you ſay, You are ſo; and, your *Church Infallible*, becauſe ſhe pretends to be ſo.

Commonit. c. 3.

3. *That our belief of the Scriptures muſt be reſolved into an unwritten Word, which is defined by your Church to be ſuch.* This is that, for whoſe ſake all your other diſcourſe is brought in, and is the main thing to the purpoſe: Although you pretend likewiſe to a power in your *Church*, to declare *what Chriſt ſaid when he held his peace.* (But, are you ſure your *Church* will be infallible in that too?) For when his *Lordſhip* had ſaid, *That where-ever Chriſt held his peace, and that his words are not regiſtred, no man may dare without raſhneſs, to ſay, They were theſe or theſe:* You very gravely add, *That his Lordſhip muſt give you leave to tell him, you muſt bind up his whole aſſertion with this* Proviſo, *but according as the Church ſhall declare.* Your *Church* then muſt declare when *Chriſt* held his peace, and when he did not; when he ſpake ſo, that others might hear him, and when he did not; when any thing was taken notice of that he ſaid, and when not. But when it is apparent Chriſt both ſpake, and did much more than ever was written, how well doth your Church acquit her Office in being *Chriſt's Remembrancer?*

§. 7.

P. 68.

And

And therefore I believe your Church will be guilty of the ſame raſhneſs with any private perſon in S. *Auguſtine's Opinion, In offering to determine what Chriſt ſaid when either he held his peace, or his words are not*
T. 6. *regiſtred.* As for thoſe things which you mention *for Traditions, not contrary to God's written Word, which yet are not an unwritten Word, ſuch as the Ceremonies of Baptiſm* by you mentioned, they are therefore not pertinent to our purpoſe, becauſe they are only rites and ceremonies, and our diſcourſe is about *doctrinal Traditions*; neither yet if I would ſpend time in the enquiry, could you derive them from *Apoſtolical Tradition*, notwithſtanding what either you, or *Bellarmine* ſay. But the ſubſtance of all you have to ſay, pertinent to your purpoſe, is, *That though every Tradition be not God's unwritten Word, yet it being neceſſary for us to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, we muſt believe it either for ſome word written or unwritten, or we ſhall have no Divine Faith at all of the Point, becauſe all Divine Faith muſt rely upon ſome Word of God.* This being a great novelty with you, that is, ſomething like Argumentation, it obliges me to take a little more particular notice of it. Any one that conſiders the force of this Argument, will find, that it lies wholly upon your notion of *Divine Faith:* for it appearing unreaſonable to you, that our belief that the Scripture is the Word, ſhould be reſolved into the written Word it ſelf; therefore you find out an *unwritten Word of God* for a *Divine Faith* to fix it ſelf upon, which can be nothing but *ſome Word of God.* To this therefore I anſwer, that when you ſay, It is neceſſary *we muſt believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God with Divine Faith,* this *Divine Faith* muſt be taken in one of theſe three ſenſes; either firſt, that Faith may be ſaid to be *Divine*, which hath a *Divine Revelation* for its *Material Object*, as, that *Faith* may be ſaid to be a *Humane Faith*, which is converſant about natural cauſes, and the effects of them: And in this ſenſe it cannot but be a *Divine Faith*, which is converſant about the *Scripture*, becauſe it is a *Divine Revelation:* Or *ſecondly*, a *Faith* may be ſaid to be *Divine*, in regard of its *Teſtimony*, or *Formal Object*; and ſo that is called a *Divine Faith*, which is built on a *Divine Teſtimony*, and that a *Humane Faith* which is built on a *Humane Teſtimony:* Thus I aſſert, all that *Faith* which reſpects particular *Objects* of *Faith*, ſuppoſing the belief of the *Scriptures*, is in this ſenſe *Divine*, becauſe it is built on a properly *Divine Teſtimony*; but the Queſtion is, Whether that *Act of Faith* which hath the whole *Scripture* as its *Material Object*, be in that ſenſe Divine or no. *Thirdly*, *Faith* may be ſaid to be *Divine*, in regard of the Divine *Effects* it hath upon the ſoul of man; as it is ſaid in *Scripture*, to *purifie the heart, overcome the world, reſiſt Satan*, and his *Temptations, receive Chriſt, &c.* And this is properly a *Divine Faith*; and there is no Queſtion, but every Chriſtian ought to have this *Divine Faith* in his ſoul, without which the other ſorts of *Divine Faith* will never bring men to Heaven. But it is apparent, that all who heartily profeſs to believe the *Scriptures to be the Word of God*, have not this ſort of *Divine Faith*, though they have ſo firm an aſſent to the Truth and Authority of it, that they durſt lay down their lives for it. The *Aſſent* therefore, we ſee, may be firm, where the effects are not ſaving: The Queſtion now is, Whether this may be called a *Divine Faith* in the ſecond ſenſe, that is, Whether it muſt be built on a *Teſtimony Infallible?* For clearing which, we muſt further conſider the meaning of this Queſtion, *How we know Scripture to be Scripture?* which may import two things, *How we know that all theſe Books contain God's Word in them?* Or ſecondly, *How we know the Doctrine contained in theſe Books to be Divine?* If you then ask me, Whether it be neceſſary that I believe with ſuch a *Faith* as is built on *Divine Teſtimony*, that theſe *Books* called the *Scripture*, contain the principles of

the

the Jewiſh and *Chriſtian Religion* in them (which we call *God's Word*) I deny it, and ſhall do ſo, till you ſhew me ſome further neceſſity of it than you have done yet; and my reaſon is, becauſe I may have ſufficient ground for ſuch an *Aſſent*, without any *Divine Teſtimony*. But if you ask me, On what ground I believe the *Doctrine to be Divine, which is contained in thoſe Books*; I then anſwer affirmatively, On a *Divine Teſtimony*; becauſe God hath given abundant evidence, that this *Doctrine* was of *Divine Revelation*. Thus you ſee, what little reaſon you have to triumph in your Argument *from Divine Faith*, inferring the neceſſity of an *unwritten Word of God*. But, the further explication of theſe things muſt be reſerved, till I come to the poſitive part of our way of *reſolution of Faith*. I now return.

§. 8. Having, after your way (that is, very unſatisfactorily) attempted the vindicating your reſolution of Faith, from the Objections which were offered againſt it by his Lordſhip; you come now to conſider the ſecond way propounded by him for the reſolving Faith, which is, *That Scripture ſhould* P. 69. n. 10. *be fully and ſufficiently known, as by divine and infallible Teſtimony, by the reſplendency of that light which it hath in it ſelf only, and by the witneſs it can ſo give to it ſelf*; againſt which he gives ſuch evident reaſons, that you acknowledge *the Relator himſelf hath ſufficiently confuted it, and you agree with him in the Confutation.* Yet herein you grow very angry with him, P. 69. n. 3. *for ſaying, That this Doctrine may agree well enough with your grounds, in regard you hold, that Tradition may be known for God's Word by its own light, and conſequently the like may be ſaid of Scripture.* This you call *aſperſing you, and obtruding falſhoods upon you.* Whether it be ſo or no, muſt appear upon examination. Two Teſtimonies are cited from *A. C.* to this purpoſe, the firſt is, *Tradition of the Church is of a Company, which by its own light, ſhews it ſelf to be infallibly aſſiſted.* Your Anſwer is, *That the word* [*which*] *muſt properly relate to the preceeding word Company, and not to the more remote word Tradition.* But what of all this? Doth any thing the leſs follow, *which the Biſhop charged* A. C. *with?* For it being granted by you, *That there can be no knowing an Apoſtolical Tradition, but for the Infallibility of the preſent Church*; the ſame *light* which diſcovers the Infallibility of that Company, doth likewiſe diſcover the Truth of Tradition. If therefore your *Church* doth appear infallible by its own *light*, which is your own confeſſion, May not the *Scripture* as well appear infallible by its own light. For is there not as great *ſelf-evidence*, at leaſt, that the *Scripture* is *infallible*, as that your *Church* is *infallible?* And therefore that way you take to ſhift the Objection, makes it return upon you with greater force: For, I pray tell me, how any Company can appear by its own *Light* to be aſſiſted by the *Holy Ghoſt*, and not much more the *Holy Scripture* to be divine? Eſpecially ſeeing you muſt at laſt be forced to derive this *Infallibility* from the *Scriptures*. For, you pretend to no other Infallibility, than what comes by a promiſe of the *immediate aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*. How then can any Company appear by *its own Light*, to be thus infallibly aſſiſted, unleſs it firſt appear by *its own Light*, that there was ſuch a *Promiſe?* and how can that, unleſs it antecedently appear by *its own Light*, that the *Scripture*, in which the Promiſe is written, is the *Word of God?* You tell us, *A. C.'s in-* p. 70. *tention is only to affirm, That the Church is known by her Motives of Credibility, which ever accompany her, and may very properly be called her own Light.* How well you are acquainted with *A. C.'s* intention, I know not, neither is it much matter: for, granting this to have been his intention, may not the *Scripture* be known by *her Motives of Credibility*, as well as the *Church?* and do not theſe accompany her, as much as the *Church?* and may they not be called *her Light*, as properly as thoſe of the *Church?* It is plain then, by all the ſenſes and meanings you can find out, in the very ſame, that you ſay the

Church

Church may be known by *her own Light*, the *Scripture* may much more; and therefore you have no reaſon to quarrel with his Lordſhip for affirming it.

The ſecond Teſtimony produced, is, *That a Tradition may be known to be ſuch by the Light it hath in it ſelf; in which* (you ſay) *you find not one word of Tradition being known by its own Light.* But, who are ſo blind as thoſe who will not ſee? I pray, what difference is there between a Tradition being known to be *ſuch by its own Light*, and a *Tradition* being *known* by *its own Light?* Yes, ſay you, *known to be ſuch, implies, that is, to be God's unwritten Word*; but are not doctrinal Traditions, and an unwritten Word, with you the ſame thing? Can therefore a Tradition be known to be an *unwritten Word* by its *own Light*, and not be known to be a *Tradition* by its *own Light?* Nay, How can it poſſibly be known to be an *unwritten Word*, unleſs it firſt appears to be a Tradition? for *Tradition* containing under it both thoſe that are *unwritten Words*, and thoſe that *are not*; it muſt, in order of nature, be known to be a *Tradition*, before it can be *known* to be the other: As I muſt firſt know you to be a *living Creature*, before I can know you to be a *reaſonable Creature*; and, I may much ſooner know the one than the other. You do therefore very well when you have given us ſuch occaſion for ſport, *to give us leave to laugh at it*, as you do in your next words.

§. 9. But before you leave this point you have ſome graver matter to take notice of, which is, that you deſire the Reader to conſider what the *Relator* grants, *viz. That the Church now admits of St.* James *and St.* Judes *Epiſtles, and the* Apocalypſe, *which were not received for diverſe years, after the reſt of the New Teſtament.* From which you wiſely infer, *That if ſome Books are now to be admitted for Canonical which were not always acknowledged to be ſuch, then upon the ſame authority ſome Books may now be received into the Canon, which were not ſo in* Ruffinus *his time. And therefore the Biſhop doth elſewhere unjuſtly charge the Church of* Rome, *that it had erred in receiving more Books into the Canon, than were received in* Ruffinus *his time.* To which I Anſwer. 1. By your own confeſſion then, the *Church of Rome* doth now receive into the *Canon* more Books than ſhe did in *Ruffinus* his time; from whence I enquire, whether the preſent *Church of Rome* were *Infallible* in *Ruffinus* his time in determining the *Canon* of the *Scripture? If not*, then the *preſent Church* is no Infallible propounder of the *Word of God*, and then all your diſcourſe comes to nothing. *If ſhe were Infallible* then, ſhe cannot be now, for now ſhe determines *otherwiſe* as to a main *point* of *Faith* than ſhe did then; unleſs you will ſay, your *Church* can be *Infallible* in determining both parts of a contradiction to be true. 2. Is the integrity of the *Canon* of *Scripture* an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, or no? I doubt not, but you will ſay, It is; if ſo, Whether were theſe Books which you admit now and were not admitted then, known to be of the *Canon* by this *Apoſtolical Tradition?* If not, by what right come they now to be of the *Canon?* If ſo, then was not your *Church* in *Ruffinus*'s time, much to ſeek for her *Infallibility*, in defining what was *Apoſtolical Tradition*, and what not? 3. Your main principle on which the lawfulneſs of adding more Books to the *Canon* of the *Scripture* is built, is, *That it is in the power of your Church judicially and authoritatively to determine what books belong to the Canon of the Scripture, and what not*, which I utterly deny. For it is impoſſible that your *Church*, or any in the world, can by any definition make that *Book* to be *Divine*, which was not ſo before ſuch a definition: For the *Divinity* of the *Book* doth meerly ariſe from *Divine Revelation.* Can your *Church* then make that to be a *Divine Revelation*, which was not ſo? All that any *Church* in the world can do in this caſe, is, not to conſtitute any new *Canon*, which were to make *Books Divine* which were not ſo, but to uſe its utmoſt diligence and care in ſearching into the *authenticalneſs* of

thoſe

thoſe *Copyes* which have any pretence to be of the *Canon*, and whether they did originally proceed from ſuch perſons, as we have reaſon to believe had an *immediate aſſiſtance* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and according to the evidence they find that the *Church* may declare and give in her verdict. For the *Church* in this caſe is but a *Jury* of *grand Inqueſt* to ſearch into matters of *Fact*, and not a *Judge* upon the *Bench* to determine in point of *Law*. And that is the true reaſon, why the *Books* of the *New Teſtament* were gradually recieved into the *Canon*, and ſome a great while after others, as St. *James*, St. *Jude*, *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, and the *Apocalypſe*; becauſe at firſt, the Copyes being not ſo publickly diſperſed, there was not that occaſion miniſtred to the *Church* for examination of them; upon which, when by degrees they came to be more publick, it cauſed ſcruples in many concerning them, becauſe they appeared no ſooner: eſpecially if any paſſages in them ſeemed to gratifie any of the *Sects* then appearing; as the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the *Novatians*; and the *Apocalypſe*, the *Millenary's*: But when upon a through ſearch and examination of all circumſtances, it did appear that theſe Copyes were authentical and did originally proceed from *Divine perſons*, then they came to be admitted and owned for ſuch by the *Univerſal Church*, which we call being admitted *into the Canon of the Scripture*. Which I take to be the only true and juſt account of that which is called the conſtituting the *Canon of Scripture*, not as though either the *Apoſtles* met to do it, or St. *John* intended any ſuch thing by thoſe words in the end of *the Apocalypſe* (for that book being as much lyable to queſtion as any, how could that ſeal the *Canon* for all the reſt) much leſs, that it was in the power of any *Church* or *Council*, and leaſt of all of the *Pope*, to determine what was *Canonical*, and what not: but only that the *Church* upon examination and enquiry, did by her Univerſal reception of theſe *Books*, declare it ſelf ſatisfied with the *evidence* which was produced, that thoſe were true and authentick *Copies* which were abroad under ſuch names or titles, and that there was great reaſon to believe by a continued tradition from the age and time theſe Books were written in, that they were written by ſuch perſons, who were not only free from any deſign of *impoſture*, but gave the greateſt Rational evidence, that they had a more ſpecial and immediate aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit. You ſee then, to how little advantage to your Cauſe you made this *digreſſion*.

§. 10.

As to the third way propounded for reſolving the Queſtion, *How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God*, viz. *by the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt*; three things you object againſt the *Biſhops diſcourſe* about it; *Firſt, that his diſcourſe is roving and uncertain. 2. That notwithſtanding his brags he muſt have recourſe to a private ſpirit himſelf. 3. That though the Biſhop would ſeem to deny it, diverſe eminent Proteſtants do reſolve their Faith into the private ſpirit.* This being the ſubſtance of what you ſay, I ſhall return a particular Anſwer to each of them. For the firſt you tell us, *He delivers himſelf in ſuch a roving way of diſcourſe, as ſignifies nothing in effect as to what he would drive at.* No? that is ſtrange, when that which his *Lordſhip* drives at, is, to ſhew how far this opinion is to be allowed and how far not, which he is ſo far from roving in, that he clearly and diſtinctly propounds the ſtate of the queſtion and the reſolution of it: which in ſhort is this, *If by the teſtimony of the ſpirit be meant any ſpecial revelation of a new object of Faith, then he denys the truth of it at leaſt in an ordinary way, both becauſe God never ſends us to look for ſuch a teſtimony, and becauſe it would expoſe men to the danger of Enthuſiaſms: but if by the teſtimony of the Spirit be meant the habit or the act of Divine infuſed Faith, by vertue of which they believe the object which appears credible, then he grants the truth but denies the pertinency of it, becauſe it is quite out of the ſtate of the queſtion, which inquires only after a ſufficient means to make this object credible, againſt all impeachment of folly and temerity in believing, whether men do actually believe or not*

Pag. 70, 71.

P. 71, 72.

P. 74. n. 12.

p. 74. n. 12. *not. And withal adds, that the queſtion is of ſuch outward and evident means, as other men may take notice of, as well as our ſelves.* Judge you now, whether this may be called *roving*; if it be ſo, I can freely excuſe you from *it* in all the diſcourſes I have met with in your Book, who abhorre nothing more than a true ſtating, and methodical handling any queſtion.

But yet (ſay you) *the Biſhop cannot free himſelf from that imputation of recurring to the private ſpirit, againſt any that ſhould preſs the buſineſs home.* Sure you refer us here to ſome one elſe who is able to preſs a buſineſs home, for you never attempt it your ſelf; and inſtead of that, only produce a large teſtimony out of *A. C. That he did not acquit the Biſhop wholly of this.* Whether he did or no is to little purpoſe, and yet thoſe very words which his Lordſhip cites, are in your teſtimony produced out of him. Only what you add more from him, that he muſt be driven to it; that his *Lordſhip* denies, and neither *A. C.* or you have been able to prove it.

But though the Biſhop ſeems not only to deny any ſuch private revelation himſelf, but will not confeſs that any Proteſtants hold it; yet (you ſay) *there can be no doubt in this, ſince* Calvin *and* Whitaker *do both ſo expreſly own it.* But according to thoſe principles laid down before, both theſe teſtimonies are eaſily anſwered. For, 1. Neither of them doth imply any *private revelation* of any *new object*, but only a particular application of the evidence appearing in *Scripture* to the conſcience of every believer. 2. That theſe teſtimonies do not ſpeak of the *external evidence* which others are capable of, but of the internal ſatisfaction of every ones conſcience. Therefore *Calvin* ſaith, *Si conſcientiis optimè conſultum volumus, &c.* If we will ſatisfie our own conſciences; not, If we will undertake to give a ſufficient reaſon to others of our Faith. So *Whitaker*, *Eſſe enim dicimus certius & illuſtrius teſtimonium quo nobis perſuadeatur hos libros eſſe ſacros, &c.* There is a more certain and noble teſtimony by which we may be perſwaded that theſe *Books* are ſacred, *viz.* that of the *Holy Ghoſt.* 3. Neither of theſe teſtimonies affirm any more, than the more judicious Writers among your ſelves do. Your *Canus* aſſerts *the neceſſity of an internal efficient cauſe, by ſpecial aſſiſtance of the ſpirit moving us to believe, beſides and beyond all humane authorities and motives, which of themſelves are not ſufficient to beget Faith, and this* (a little after) *he calls, Divinum quoddam lumen incitans ad credendum, A divine light moving us to believe*; and again, *Interius lumen infuſum à Spiritu Sancto, an inward light infuſed by the Spirit of God.* There is nothing in the ſayings of the moſt rigid *Proteſtants* is more hard to explain or vindicate from a *private revelation* than this is: if, as you ſay, one would preſs it home. Nay hath not your own *Stapleton*, *Calvins* very phraſe *of the neceſſity of the ſecret teſtimony of the Spirit that one believe the teſtimony and judgement of the Church concerning Scripture*? And is there not then as much danger of *Enthuſiaſm* in believing the Teſtimony of your *Church*, as in believing the *Scriptures*? Nay, doth not your *Gregory de Valentiâ* rather go higher than the teſtimonies by you produced out of *Calvin* and *Whitaker* on this very ſubject, in the beginning of his diſcourſe of the *reſolution of Faith*? *It is God himſelf*, ſaith he, *in the firſt place, which muſt convince and perſwade the minds of men of the truth of the Chriſtian Doctrine, and conſequently of the Sacred Scriptures, by ſome inward inſtinct and impulſe; as it appears from Scripture it ſelf, and is fully explained by Proſper.* If you will then undertake to clear this *inward inſtinct and impulſe* upon the minds of men, whereby they are perſwaded of the truth of Chriſtianity and Scripture,

Inſtitut. l. 1. c. 7. ſect. 4.

Controv. de Script. q. 3. c. 1.

Id ſtatuendum eſt, authoritatem humanam & incitamenta omnia illa prædicta, ſive alia quæcunq; adhibita ab eo qui proponit fidem, non eſſe ſufficientes cauſas ad credendum ut credere teneamur. ſed præterea opus eſt interiore cauſâ efficiente, i. e. Dei ſpeciali auxilio moventis ad credendum. Locor. theol. l. 2. c. 8. Reſp. ad 4. arg. l. 2. c. 8. ſect. *Jam ſi hæc.*

Arcanum hoc divini Spiritûs teſtimonium prorſus neceſſarium eſt, ut quis Eccleſiæ teſtimonio ac judicio, circa Scripturarum approbationem credat. Triplicat. adverſ. Whitak. cap. 3.

Et verò Deus ipſe imprimis eſt qui Chriſtianam doctrinam, atq; adeò Scripturam ſacram veram eſſe, tum revelationis ſuæ, & interno quodam inſtinctu & impulſu humanis mentibus conteſtatur atq; perſuadet; ut in eâ ipſa ſcripturâ multis in locis eſt expreſſum, & præclarè à Proſpero Aquitanico explicatur. De Analyſi fidei l. 1. c. 1.

Scripture, from *Enthuſiaſm* and a *private ſpirit* you may as eaſily do it for the utmoſt which is ſaid by *Calvin*, or *Whitaker*, or any other *Proteſtant Divine*. This therefore is only an argument of your deſire to cavil, and as ſuch I will paſs it over. For what concerns the influence which the *Spirit* hath in the reſolution of *Faith*, it will be enquired into afterwards.

The *laſt way* mentioned in order to the *reſolution of Faith*, is, that of *Reaſon, which* (his Lordſhip ſaith) *cannot be denyed to have ſome place to come in, and prove what it can. According to which* (he tells us) *no man can be hindred from weighing the tradition of the Church, the inward motives in Scripture it ſelf, all teſtimonies within, which ſeem to bear witneſs to it; and in all this* (ſaith he) *there is no harm: the danger is, when a man will uſe no other ſcale but reaſon, or prefer reaſon before any other ſcale. Reaſon then, can give no ſupernatural ground into which a man may reſolve his Faith, that the Scripture is the word of God infallibly; yet Reaſon can go ſo high, as it can prove that Chriſtian Religion, which reſts upon the authority of this Book, ſtands upon ſurer grounds of nature, reaſon, common equity, and juſtice, then any thing in the world, which any Infidel, or meer naturaliſt, hath done, doth, or can adhere unto, againſt it, in that which he makes, accounts, or aſſumes as Religion to himſelf.* This is the ſubſtance of his Lordſhips diſcourſe about the uſe of Reaſon; in which we obſerve, §. 11. P. 74. n. 13. N. 14.

1. That he doth not make *reaſon* a means ſufficient to ground an *Infallible belief, that Scripture is the word of God.* And therefore you are guilty of notorious oſcitancy, or wilful calumny, in telling us, *That natural reaſon is introduced by the Biſhop for that end.* By which we may gueſs at the truth of what you ſay at the end of your *interlocutory diſcourſe between the Biſhop and the Heathen, that you have not wronged him, by either falſly impoſing on him, or diſſembling the force of his arguments*, wherein you are ſo guilty, that the only extenuation of your crime had been, never to have profeſſed the contrary. For you give us a hopeful *ſpecimen* of your fair dealings at your entrance on this ſubject. P. 72. l. 9, 10. P. 75. l. 5.

2. Though reaſon cannot give a *ſupernatural ground* whereby to reſolve *Faith* as to the *Scriptures being Gods Word Infallibly*; yet reaſon may abundantly prove to any one who queſtions it, the *truth* and *reaſonableneſs* of *Chriſtian Religion*. By which if you pleaſe, you may take notice of a *double reſolution of Faith*: the one is, into the *truth* and *reaſonableneſs* of the *Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity* conſidered in it ſelf; and the other is, into the *Infallible means* of the *conveyance* of that Doctrine to us, which is the *Scripture*. When therefore his Lordſhip offers to deal with a *Heathen*, he doth not as you, either ſillily or wilfully, would make him ſay, *That he would prove Infallibly to him, that the Bible is Gods word*, but that *Chriſtian Religion* hath ſo much the advantage above all others, as to make it appear that it ſtands upon ſurer grounds of *nature, reaſon, common equity* and *juſtice*, than any thing in the world, which any one who queſtions it doth adhere unto. Which I think is a thing that no one, who underſtands *Chriſtian Religion*, would be afraid to undertake againſt any *Infidel* of what ſort or nature ſoever. Theſe things being premiſed, your grand piece of *Sophiſtry in the diſpute between the Heathen and the Biſhop*, whom you ſo ſolemnly introduce at a *Conference* about Religion, doth evidently diſcover it ſelf. Wherein, *you bring in your learned Heathen, as one deſiring ſatisfaction in matter of Religion; but being not verſt in Chriſtian Principles, deſires to be ſatisfied by the evidence of natural reaſon; which when the Biſhop hath condeſcended to; your very next thing is, that your Heathen underſtands by his Lordſhips Book, that the ſole foundation of our Faith is a Book called the Bible; which, ſaith he, you tell me muſt be believed Infallibly with every part and parcel in it, to be the undoubted Word of the true God, before I can believe any other point of Religion as it ought to be believed. As to* P. 72. n. 5.

which, your Heathen ſees no ground to aſſent that it is Gods Word. But by this way of management of your diſpute, we may eaſily diſcern which way the iſſue of it is like to go. Doth his Lordſhip any where undertake to prove this in the firſt place *Infallibly* to a *Heathen, That the Bible muſt be Infallibly believed to be Gods Word?* No, he offers to prove, firſt, the *excellency* and the *reaſonableneſs* of the *Chriſtian Religion* conſidered in its ſelf. From whence you might eaſily conceive how the *diſpute* ought to be managed; ſhewing firſt that the *precepts* of Chriſtianity are highly juſt and reaſonable, the *Promiſes* of it ſuch as may induce any reaſonable man to the *practice* of thoſe *Precepts*; and that the whole *Doctrine* is ſuch, as may appear to any conſiderative perſon to have been very wiſely contrived: That there is nothing vain or impertinent in it, but that it is deſigned for *great* and *excellent purpoſes*, the bringing men off from the love of ſin to the love of *God*; that it is impoſſible to imagine any *Doctrine* to be contrived with more *advantage* for promoting theſe *ends*, becauſe it repreſents to us the higheſt expreſſions of the *Kindneſs* and *Goodneſs* of *God* to man, and that the Promiſes made by *God* were confirmed to the world by the death of his only Son; That ſince mens *natures* are now ſo degenerate, *God* hath made a tender of *Grace*, and *divine aſſiſtance*, whereby to enable men to perform the excellent duties of this Religion. That thoſe *things* which ſeem moſt hard to *believe* in this *Doctrine*, are not ſuch things as might have been ſpared out of it (as though *God* did intend only to puzzle mens reaſon with them) but they are ſuch *myſteries*, as it is impoſſible the wit of man can conceive they ſhould have been diſcovered upon better *reaſons*, or for more excellent *ends*; as, that a *Virgin ſhould conceive by the immediate power of God*, to bring him into the world, who ſhould be the *Saviour* of it; *That there ſhould be a reſurrection of bodies*, in order to a compleat felicity of them who obey this Doctrine; and ſo for others of a like nature: that ſuppoſing it poſſible ſuch things ſhould be, it is impoſſible to conceive they ſhould be done upon better *grounds*, or for better purpoſes than they are in *Chriſtian Religion*. This being now a ſhort *draught* or *Idea* of *Chriſtianity*, is the *firſt* thing which I ſuppoſe any learned or inquiſitive *Heathen* or *Infidel* ſhould be acquainted with; if he finds fault with this, let him in any thing ſhew the incongruity or unreaſonableneſs of it. If he acknowledge this model of the *Doctrine* reaſonable, his next ſcruple is, Whether this be truly the *Model* of it or no; for that end I tell him, we have a *Book* among us, which is, and ever hath been, by *Chriſtians*, taken for granted, to comprize in it the Principles of *Chriſtian Religion*; I bid him take it, and read it ſeriouſly, and ſee if that which I have given him as the *Idea* of *Chriſtian Doctrine*, do not perfectly agree with that Book. I do not bid him preſently *abſolutely and infallibly believe this Book to be God's Word*, which is a very prepoſterous way of proceeding; but only compare the *Doctrine* with the *Book*, as he would do a body of *Civil Law*, with the *Inſtitutes* of it; or the Principles of any Science, with the moſt approved Authors of it. If after this ſearch, he be ſatisfied, that the repreſentation I gave him of *Chriſtian Religion*, agrees with thoſe *Books* we call the *Bible*; he yet further adds, that he acknowledges the Principles of our *Religion* to be *reaſonable*; but deſires to be ſatisfied of the *Truth* of them; I muſt further enquire, Whether he doth believe any thing elſe to *be* in the world, beſides what he hath ſeen and heard himſelf? I may juſtly ſuppoſe his Anſwer *Affirmative*; I then demand upon what grounds, A. *Upon the certain report of honeſt men, who have ſeen and heard other things than ever he did.* But why do you think honeſt mens reports to be credible in ſuch caſes? A. *Becauſe, I ſee, they have no deſign or intereſt to deceive me in it.* Will you then believe the report of ſuch men, whom, I can make it appear, could have no intereſt in deceiving you? A. *I can ſee no reaſon to*

the

the contrary. Will you then believe ſuch men, who loſt their lives to make it appear, that their Teſtimony was true? A. *Yes.* Will you believe ſuch things, wherein perſons of ſeveral Ages, Profeſſions, Nations, Religions, Intereſts, are all agreed that they were ſo? A. *Yes, if it be only to believe a matter of fact on their Teſtimony; I can ſee no ground to queſtion it.* That is all I deſire of you, and therefore you muſt believe that there was in the world ſuch a perſon as *Jeſus Chriſt*, who dyed, & roſe again; and, while he lived, wrought great *miracles* to confirm his *Doctrine* with; and that he ſent out Apoſtles to preach this Doctrine in the world, who likewiſe did work many *miracles*, and that ſome of theſe perſons the better to preſerve and convey this Doctrine did write the ſubſtance of all that *Chriſt* either did, or ſpake, and withall penned ſeveral *Epiſtles* to thoſe *Churches* which were planted by them. Theſe are all *matters of fact*, and therefore on your former Principle you are to believe them. There are then but two Scruples left, *Suppoſing all this true, yet this doth not prove the Doctrine Divine; nor the Scriptures, which convey it, to be infallible.* To which I anſwer, 1. Can you queſtion, whether that *Doctrine* be *Divine*, when the *perſon* who declared it to the world, was ſo *divine* and *extraordinary* a perſon, not only in his converſation, but in thoſe frequent and unparallel'd *Miracles* which he wrought in the ſight and face of his enemies, who, after his death, did riſe again, and converſe with his Diſciples, who gave evidence of their fidelity in the Teſtimony they gave of it, by laying down their lives to atteſt the Truth of it? Again, Can you queſtion the *Divinity* of that *Doctrine*, which tended ſo apparently to the deſtruction of ſin and wickedneſs, and the power of the evil *Spirit* in the world? For, we cannot think he would quit his poſſeſſion willingly out of the bodies and ſouls of men; that therefore which threw him out of both, muſt be, not only a *Doctrine* directly contrary to his intereſt, but infinitely exceeding him in *power*: And that can be no leſs than *Divine*. But ſtill, you will ſay, *Is it not, beſides all this, neceſſary to believe theſe very Books, you call the Scripture, to be divinely inſpired; and how ſhould I know that?* To that I anſwer, 1. That which *God* chiefly requires from you, is, the belief of the *Truth* and *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*; for that is the *Faith* which will bring you to obedience, which is the thing *God* aims at. 2. If you believe the *Doctrine* to be *True* and *Divine*, you cannot reaſonably queſtion the *Infallibility of the Scripture.* For, in that you read, that not only *Chriſt* did miracles, but his *Apoſtles* too; and therefore their *Teſtimony*, whether writing or ſpeaking was equally *infallible*; all that you want evidence for, is, that ſuch *perſons* writ theſe *Books*, and that being a *matter of fact*, was ſufficiently proved and acknowledged before. Thus you ſee, if we take a right method, and not jumble things confuſedly together, as you do, what a ſatisfactory account may be given to any inquiſitive perſon; firſt, of the *Reaſonableneſs*; next, of the *Truth*; and laſtly, of the *Divinity*, both of the *Doctrine*, and the *Books* containing it, which we call the *Scripture.*

§. 12. Let us now again ſee, *How you make the Biſhop and Heathen diſpute.* The ſubſtance of which, is, *That you make your Heathen deſire no leſs than infallible evidence that the Bible is God's Word by conviction of natural reaſon*; whereas his Lordſhip attemps only to make the *Authority of Scriptures* appear by ſuch Arguments, as unbelievers themſelves could not but think reaſonable, if they weighed them with indifferency. *For, though,* ſaith he, *this Truth, That Scripture is the Word of God, is not ſo demonſtratively evident à priori, as to inforce aſſent, yet it is ſtrengthened ſo abundantly with probable Arguments, both from the Light of Nature it ſelf, and Humane Teſtimony, that he muſt be very wilful and ſelf-conceited, that ſhall dare to ſuſpect it.* P. 77. n. 15. And ſure any reaſonable man in the world would think it ſufficient to deal with

with an adverſary upon ſuch terms. But, ſaies your *Heathen*, *A man cannot be infallibly certain of what is ſtrengthned with but probable Arguments, ſince that which is but probably true, may alſo be ſaid to be probably falſe.* Which being a thing ſo often objected againſt us by your party, muſt be ſomewhat further explained. How far *Infallibility* may be admitted in our belief, may partly be perceived by what hath been ſaid already, and what ſhall be ſaid more afterwards. That there is, and ought to be the higheſt degree of *actual Certainty*; I aſſert as much as you: But ſay you, *The very Arguments being but probable, deſtroy it*: To which I anſwer, by explaining the meaning of *probable Arguments*, in this caſe; whereby are not underſtood ſuch kind of *Probabilities*, which cannot raiſe a firm *Aſſent*, in which ſenſe we ſay, *That which is probable to be, is probable not to be*; but by *Probabilities* are only meant ſuch kind of *rational Evidence*, which may yield a ſufficient foundation for a *firm Aſſent*, but yet notwithſtanding, which an *obſtinate perſon* may *deny Aſſent*. As for Inſtance, if you were to diſpute with the *Atheiſt* concerning the *Exiſtence* of a *Deity*, which he denies, and ſhould proceed with you juſt as your *Heathen* doth with the *Biſhop*. Sir, All that Religion that you talk of, is built only upon the belief of a *God*, but I cannot be *infallibly convinced by natural reaſon, that there is ſuch a one*. You preſently tell him, that there is ſo much evidence for a *Deity*, from the works of nature, the conſent of all people, *&c.* that he can have no reaſon to queſtion it. But ſtill he replies, *None of theſe are demonſtrations*, for notwithſtanding I have conſidered theſe I believe the contrary; but *demonſtrations* would make me *infallibly certain*; theſe then are no more but *probable Arguments, and therefore ſince it is but probably true, it may be probably falſe*. How then will you ſatisfie ſuch a perſon? Can you do it any otherwiſe, than by ſaying, that we have as great *Evidence* as the nature of the *thing* will bear, and it is unreaſonable to require more? Unleſs you will tell him, it is to no purpoſe to believe a *God*, unleſs he *believe it infallibly*; and there being no *infallible Arguments* in nature, he muſt believe it on the *Infallibility of your Church*. And do you not think, this were an excellent way to confute *Atheiſts*? But when we ſpeak of *probable Arguments*, we mean not ſuch as are apt to leave the mind *in ſuſpence*, whether the thing be true or no; but only ſuch as are not *proper* and *rigid demonſtrations*, or *infallible Teſtimony*, but the *higheſt Evidence* which the *nature* of the thing will bear, and therefore may cauſe an *undoubted Certainty* of *Aſſent*. As it is in all *matters of fact*; for, Will you ſay, that it is as *probable*, that there is not ſuch a *place* as *Rome*, as that there is, becauſe the only Argument you have to be convinced of it, is but in it ſelf a *probability*, which is the fame and report of people. It is a piece therefore of great weakneſs of judgement, to ſay, That there can be no *certain Aſſent*, where there is a meer *poſſibility* of being deceived. For there is no kind of *Aſſent* in the humane underſtanding, as to the exiſtence of any thing, but there is a *poſſibility* of *deception* in it. Will you ſay, becauſe it is poſſible all mens ſenſes may deceive them, therefore there can be no *certainty* of any object of *ſenſe*? And, as well may you ſay it, as deſtroy any certainty of *Aſſent* in *Religion*, where you ſuppoſe a poſſibility of being deceived. But, if I be not much deceived (though I ſuppoſe you will account it a grand *Paradox*) an *Aſſent* may be as firm and *certain* upon *moral grounds*, as upon a *demonſtration*, that is, when the *matter* is capable of no more than *moral grounds*. For, the reaſon why we *ſuſpend Aſſent*, is the *unproportionateneſs* of the *evidence* to the *matter* to be proved: So when the *matter* is capable of more *evidence* than is produced, and *I know it to be ſo*, my *underſtanding* cannot firmly *aſſent* on ſuch *evidence*; but when the *matter* is capable of no more than *moral evidence*, and *I know it*, I may as firmly *aſſent* to the *Truth* of ſuch a thing, as to the *Truth* of a *clearer* thing, upon clearer *evidence*.

dence. Thus I may as firmly *aſſent*, that there are ſuch *places* as the *Eaſt* and *Weſt-Indies*, upon the conſtant report of men, as that the *three angles of a triangle, are equal to two right angles*: I ſay not, the *evidence* is the *ſame*, but that the *aſſent* may be as *firm*. You cannot then deſtroy the *certainty of aſſent*, which is required to *Chriſtian Religion*, by telling men, that the *arguments* they rely on, are but *moral arguments*: And by this, you may ſee, there may be a degree far beyond *probability* in the *aſſent*, where the Arguments in themſelves conſidered, may be called *probable*; or rather, that *Moral certainty* may be a moſt *firm*, *rational*, and *undoubted certainty*. Your following diſcourſe *between the Biſhop and Heathen*, runs upon the former miſtake, as though his intention were to prove firſt the *Bible* to be *God's Infallible Word*, before he would prove *Chriſtian Religion to be true*, which I have already ſhewed you, is a miſtake, which appears ſufficiently by his own words, *of proving the Chriſtian Religion to ſtand upon ſurer grounds than any other Religion*; not only than *that one* which the *Heathen* believed, but *any other* in the world: and therefore your Objection is anſwered, that for all this, *a third Religion may be truer than both*. Your remaining diſcourſe proves nothing at all, but on the former Suppoſition; and therefore, ſuppoſing his intention be to prove *Chriſtianity* to be *True* and *Divine*, his Argument *from the power of it over the Devil*, follows plainly enough. And when he mentions the *evidence of it out of Scripture*, he doth not ſuppoſe the belief of it *as an infallible Word of God*, but only as of any other *hiſtory*, and therefore is far from ſuch a *petitio principii*, as you imagine. That which *the Biſhop ſaith, may reaſonably be ſuppoſed, as a Principle in Divinity* (as there are *poſtulata* in other Sciences) is not the *Infallibility of the Doctrine, or Revelation*, but the *Credibility* of both, in order to further *Conviction* concerning their *Infallibility*; for, unleſs the *Credibility* of it be firſt aſſumed as a *Principle*, men will not uſe the means in order to conviction of its *Infallibility*. And in this ſenſe he doth not contradict himſelf, nor unſay what he had ſaid before; and that this was his ſenſe, appears by the laſt words of that diſcourſe, *That a meer natural man may be thus far convinced, that the Text of God is a very credible Text*. Thus we ſee, how much, notwithſtanding your proteſtation to the contrary, *You have wronged the Biſhop, both by falſly impoſing on him, and diſſembling the force of his argument*: And how unjuſt that imputation is, *That if his Doctrine had been held in the Primitive Church, it would have laid the world under an impoſſibility of being converted to Chriſtianity*; whereas I have ſhewed how conſonant his way is, as I explained it, both to reaſon, and the proceedings of the Primitive *Chriſtians* in the converſion of learned *Heathens*.

P. 73.

P. 80. n. 18.

§. 13. But ſince you will needs ſet *the Biſhop to convert a learned Heathen*, I will ſee what an excellent faculty you have according to your Principles of ſatisfying an *Atheiſt*, or a *Sceptick in Religion*, whom, for your ſake, I will ſuppoſe more deſirous of ſatisfaction, than commonly ſuch perſons are. Let us ſee then how he accoſts you.

Scept. Sir, I underſtand by a *great book of yours*, that you have only taken the right courſe to convince ſuch perſons as my ſelf, who are a little doubtful concerning the received Principles of Religion in the world; for the wiſeſt I have converſed with, of thoſe who own thoſe things, do offer only to prove them by *Reaſon* and *arguments*, which, I underſtand, you decry, *as a way to make all men ſuch as I am*: but that you have an excellent *Recipe* for men under my *diſtemper*; for you promiſe them *no leſs than Infallible certainty* in all things you require them to believe, which is a thing I have been ſo long ſeeking for, and have yet ſo unhappily miſt of, that I cannot but rejoyce in meeting with ſuch *a healing Prieſt*, who offers nothing ſhort of *Infallibility* in all matters of *Religion*.

T. C.

T. C. Sir, I queſtion not, but before you and I part, I ſhall cure thoſe *diſtorted joynts* of your mind, and inſtead of being a *Sceptick*, make you a ſound *Catholick*. For indeed it is true, what you ſay, That thoſe who would convince you by reaſon, do but offer to make you more a *Sceptick* than you are, at leaſt, *you can have no Divine Faith at all upon ſuch principles*; but if you will follow my counſel, I doubt not but to make *you Infallibly certain* in the things we require you to believe.

Scept. I ſee then there is hope of a cure for me; but I pray tell me what that is I muſt be *Infallibly certain* of, and by what means I ſhall attain it. I would therefore in the *firſt place* be *Infallibly certain* of the *being* of *God*, and the *immortality of ſouls*, for theſe I take to be the principles of all Religion.

T. C. You take a wrong method, you ſhould firſt enquire after the *means* of this *Infallible certainty*, for when once you have got that, it will make you *Infallibly certain* of what ever you deſire; but as long as you uſe ſtill ſo much *reaſon*, as to demand *Infallible certainty* in *principles* before *concluſions*, there is little hopes of your being a true *Roman Catholick*. But I muſt tell you, this is not the way: You muſt *firſt believe the Church*, and then you *may believe any thing*.

Scept. But would you have me attain *Infallible certainty*, without any *reaſon* that is *Infallible*? But becauſe you quarrel with my method, I will yield to yours, but let me deſire to know firſt, *What thoſe things are which I muſt believe upon this Infallibility*? and then, *Whether nothing ſhort of this Infallible certainty will ſerve in order to Faith*? for if ſo, I muſt confeſs my ſelf not only a *Sceptick* but an *Infidel*.

T. C. *All objects of Faith muſt be believed with Infallible certainty*, and nothing ſhort of *that* can be *true Faith*, for *true Divine Faith muſt rely on Divine Authority*, or ſome *Word of God*: now becauſe you cannot rely *on Gods written word* for the *Divine Authority of it ſelf*, you muſt rely on ſome *Divine unwritten word*; which can be no other but what is delivered by the *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Roman Church*.

Scept. I was in hopes, you intended my cure, but now I perceive you aim at making me worſe; for I never heard ſo many things uttered in a breath with ſo great confidence, and ſo little ſhew of reaſon; that if I were not a *Sceptick* already, I ſhould Commence one now. You tell me indeed very magiſterially, that I cannot believe without *Infallibility*, becauſe *Faith* muſt rely on a *Divine Teſtimony*; this *Divine Teſtimony* is not in *Scripture* (as you call it) but in the *Infallibility* of your *preſent Roman Church*; I find my doubts ſo increaſe by this diſcourſe of yours, that they all croud ſo to get out, I know not how to propoſe them in order, but as well as I can. You tell me the ground why you require *Infallible certainty*, is, becauſe *Faith* muſt reſt on *Divine Authority*, and that this *Authority* muſt be that of *your Church*, which you ſay is *Infallible*: theſe things therefore I deſire of you, *firſt*, to ſhew *how your Churches Authority comes to be Divine*. 2. How *her Teſtimony comes to be Infallible*. 3. *How I may be Infallibly certain of this Infallibility*. 4. Suppoſing the *Catholick Churches Teſtimony* to be ſo, how ſuch a *Sceptick* as I am, ſhould know your *Roman Church* to be that *Catholick Church*.

T. C. Your firſt queſtion is, *How our Churches Authority comes to be Divine*? I ſee there is little hopes of doing good on you, that ask *ſuch queſtions* as theſe are; you ought quietly *to ſubmit your Faith to the Church*, and heartily believe all theſe things without queſtioning them; for I muſt tell you, ſuch kind of *queſtions* have almoſt ruined us, and hath made ſcrupulous men turn *Hereticks*, and others *Atheiſts*: but ſince I hope your *queſtions* may go no further than my *anſwers*, nor be any better underſtood, I muſt tell you; That though we ſay, that it is *neceſſary* that *Divine Faith* muſt rely on *Divine authority* becauſe that ſeems to promiſe *Infalli-*

bility

bility; yet when we come to our *Churches Teſtimony*, we dare not for fear of the *Hereticks* call it *Divine*, but *Infallible* and *in a manner*, and *after a ſort Divine*, hoping they would never take notice of any Contradiction in it, but ſtill we ſay, *As far as concerns preciſe Infallibility, it is ſo truly ſupernatural and certain, that it comes nothing ſhort of the Divineſt Teſtimony; but yet this is not Divine, though it be by the Teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, and yet is no immediate revelation; but ſtill it is ſo much, as if the Church ſhould erre, Gods veracity may be called in queſtion aſſoon as the Churches.*

Scept. I took you for a *Prieſt* before, but now I take you for an abſolute *conjurer*: but I confeſs, I like this *diſcourſe* well, for I perceive your Religion is built on ſuch *grounds*, as you never intend ſhould be underſtood, wherein I commend your *diſcretion*; for theſe *diſtinctions* will doubtleſs do your work among ſilly and ignorant people, which are a great part of mankind, and much the greateſt of your *Church*. I am therefore infinitely ſatisfied with this anſwer to my *firſt queſtion*; anſwer but the reſt ſo, and I promiſe you to be leſs a *Sceptick* than ever I was.

T. C. To your ſecond, *How her Teſtimony comes to be Infallible*; becauſe I perceive you are *an underſtanding perſon*, I will acquaint you with our way. The *Hereticks* trouble us with this *queſtion* above all others: for they preſently cry out, If you know the *Scripture* to be *Infallible* by the *Church*, and the *Church Infallible* by *Scripture*, we run into a *Circle*; and this we know as well as they, but do not think fit to let the people know it, and therefore we tell them of *things being known in themſelves and to us*, between *the formal object and the Infallible witneſs*, between *the principal cauſe and a condition prerequiſite*, between *proving of it to Hereticks and to our ſelves*; but I ſee ſome of my brethren of late have been much beholding to ſome things with *vizards* upon them called *Motives of credibility*, and the generality are ſo frighted with them, that they will rather ſay they are ſatisfied than ask any more *queſtions*; but if they do, theſe do ſo little in *truth* belong to our *Church*, that then we ſtorm, and ſweat, and cry out upon them as *Atheiſts*, and that it is impoſſible they ſhould believe any Religion who queſtion them; and if that doth it not, then we patter over the former *diſtinctions* as we do our *prayers*, and hope they are both in an *unknown tongue*.

Scept. Well, I ſee you are the man like to give me *ſatisfaction*; I pray to your third queſtion, *How I may be Infallibly certain of this Infallibility?*

T. C. That is a queſtion never asked by *Catholicks*, and if we find any propounding it whom we hoped to proſelyte, we give them *hard words* and leave them; for becauſe we offer to prove our *Infallibility* by only *motives of credibility*, they preſently ask us, Whether our *Infallibility* be *an Article of Faith?* if it be, then they may believe an *Article of Faith without Infallible certainty*, and then what need our *Churches Infallibility?* and then to what end do we quarrel with their *Faith* for being built on greater *motives of credibility?* which being ſuch untoward queſtions we ſee there is no good to be done on them and ſo leave them: but in our *Books* we are ſure to cry out of the *fallibility* and *uncertainty* of the *Faith of Proteſtants*, becauſe they acknowledge their *Church is not Infallible*, and cry up our *Church* becauſe ſhe *pretends* to it; if they ask, How we prove it, we ſeek to confound the *ſtate* of the *queſtion*, and run out into the *neceſſity of an unwritten Word*, or bring ſuch *motives* as hold only for the *Primitive* and *Apoſtolical Church*, and make them ſerve ours too. If all this will not do, we have other *ſhifts* ſtill, but it is not yet fit to diſcover them.

Scept. To your fourth *Queſtion* (and then I will tell you my judgement) *How your Church comes to be called or accounted the Catholick Church?*

T. C. For this, though it ſeems ſtrange to the *Hereticks*, how a *part* ſhould be called or accounted the *whole*, yet to all true *Catholicks*, *who muſt*

wink hard that they may ſee the better, we make no great difficulty of it ; for we tell them the *Pope* is *Chriſts Vicar*, and it is the *head* which gives the *denomination*, and ſo *Catholick* is nothing elſe but a *name* to denote perſons who are in our *Church* ; and if they queſtion this, they thereby are out of the *Church*, and ſo *under damnation* ; But for the ſturdy *Hereticks* who deride our *thunderbolts*, we are put to a greater trouble, and are fain to gather all the *citations* of the *Fathers* againſt the poor *Donatiſts*, and apply them to the *Hereticks*, and whatever they ſay belongs to the *Catholick Church* we confidently arrogate it to *our ſelves*, as though our *Church* now were the ſame with the *Catholick Church* then : and chiefly we have the advantage of the *Proteſtants* by this, that whatever *corruptions* they charge us with, they had the good *hap* to be almoſt generally received at the time *Luther* appeared, and upon this we *thunder* them with the *ſucceſſion* and *viſibility of our Church* ; as the *Samaritans* were much to blame they did not ſerve the *Iſraelites* ſo, after their return from *captivity* ; for they had a *continual ſucceſſion* in the ſame *place*, and a greater *viſibility* than the *Iſraelites* under their bondage ; but yet we had the advantage of them by a larger *ſpread*, a longer *preſcription*, and a fairer *ſhew*.

Scept. Sir, I am hugely taken with theſe diſcourſes of yours, and eaſily perceive (whatever they that believe *Chriſtian Religion* to be true think) that you are men of *wit and parts* ; and underſtand your *Intereſt*, I mean *your Religion*. I underſtand now throughly, to what *intent* it is you ſay, that *Thoſe who build their Faith on rational grounds, go about to deſtroy Religion*. I confeſs, you have taken the only way to reclaim me from any thing of *Scepticiſm*. I ſuppoſe you underſtand *my meaning*, as I do *yours*.

In this diſcourſe I pretend not, as you did, to deliver his *Lordſhips words*, and ſo wrong him by falſly impoſing them on him in another ſenſe than he intended them, but collect from your former managery of this Controverſie, what your real *ſenſe* and *meaning* is, and how excellent a *way* this is, inſtead of reclaiming *Atheiſts* to make them ſo. If I have miſtaken your meaning, I pray ſpeak more clearly, and then we ſhall think you mean *honeſtly* ; but as long as you walk ſo much in the *dark*, you will give us leave to ſuſpect your deſign is either upon our *purſes* or our *Religion*. I now return to your *Church-tradition*.

§. 14. P. 7. n. 6. You begin your ſixth Section with a fair *Suppoſition* and carry it on accordingly, *which is of a Child brought up in your Church, who is commanded to believe the Scriptures, and all other Articles of Faith on the Authority of your Church, whom you ſuppoſe to dye without once looking into the Scriptures* : Your queſtion is, *Whether he had ſaving Faith or no ; if ſo, then the Churches Authority is a ſufficient ground for Infallible Faith ; if not, then he had none at all, and conſequently could not be ſaved.* I anſwer, We pry not into *Divine ſecrets*, on which account we dare not pronounce of the final condition of ſuch who through ignorance cannot be acquainted with *Gods written Word* ; we therefore ſay, that an *hearty aſſent to the Doctrine of the Goſpel* is the *Faith* which *God* requires, and if this *Faith* lead men to obedience to *Gods will*, we aſſert the ſufficiency of it for ſalvation, and not otherwiſe ; for *Faith* is not therefore *ſaving*, becauſe built on an *Infallible ground*, as you fondly ſeem to imagine ; but when it *attains its end*, when it brings men to a hearty obedience to the *precepts* of the *Goſpel*. And if ſome among you, may believe that which is in it ſelf true, but upon weak and inſufficient grounds, as the advantages of education (which are much rather the foundation of the Faith of ſuch a one as you ſpeak of, than any Infallibility ſuppoſed by him in the *Church*) yet ſuch and ſo great is the goodneſs of *God*, that if a *Faith* ſtanding on ſuch grounds do attain its end, that is, make ſuch a one Univerſally holy, we deny not, but *God* may accept

accept of it for Salvation. But ſtill we ſay, ſuch a *Faith* is ſo far from being *Infallible*, that it is not built on any ſufficient or ſatisfactory ground, for the *motive* of it is that, which may be *falſe* as well as *true*; for he that *aſſents* to any thing on the Authority of any *Church*, before he doth judge whether her Authority be to be relyed on abſolutely or no, may believe a *falſhood* aſſoon as truth upon that *Authority*; and the more he makes this his foundation, the more he is in danger of being deceived. As ſuppoſe a Child brought up in *Turky* and inſtructed in that *Religion*; he is told that he muſt without examination believe *Mahomets Alcoran* to be *Divine*; *and he muſt neither doubt of this, nor of any other Article of Faith; univerſally received among Mahumetans*: may not ſuch a one as invincibly believe the Authority of the *Turkiſh Church* (if we may call it ſo) as your *Child* doth the Authority of your *Church*? Where then lies the difference? you ſee plainly, it cannot be in the *Motive* to Faith, for the *Authority* is ſuppoſed equally *Infallible* in both; but it lies in the evidence of *truth* in one Religion above the other, and this requires ſomething more than the *Authority* of the *Church*, *viz.* judgement and diligent examination. And then Faith is built on a ſure ground. Remember then, that we enquire not what abatements God makes for the *prejudices* of *education* in believing or not believing any Religion; nor how *God* intends to deal with them, who through age or other invincible prejudices are uncapable of judging the evidence of truth in any Religion; but what are the certain *grounds* of *Faith*, which ſober and underſtanding men may and ought to build their belief of true Religion upon. But you proceed, and *ſuppoſe your young Chriſtian to live, and apply himſelf to ſtudy, and becomes a learned man, and then upon the Churches recommendation betakes himſelf to the reading the Scriptures, upon which by the light he diſcovers in it, he finds the Faith he had before, was but a humane perſwaſion and not a Divine Faith, and conſequently that he had no ſaving Faith of any Article of Chriſtian belief, and ſo was out of the ſtate of Salvation; from whence* (you ſay) *will ſpring gripes and torture of ſpirit among Chriſtians.* And why ſo? What, becauſe they diſcern greater reaſon to believe than ever they did, *muſt they find gripes and torture of ſpirit?* I had thought, the more *light* men had found, *i. e.* the more *reaſon* for *believing*, the more peace and contentment they had in their minds. And ſo I verily believe it is: but probably your meaning is, *This Doctrine will cauſe gripes and torture of ſpirit in thoſe who have no other foundation of Faith, but your Churches authority, and never enquire after more:* If it does ſo, much good may they do them; and I verily believe, ſuch doubts may tend more to their ſatisfaction at laſt, than their preſent ſecurity; and a Doctrine which tends to convince the world of the folly and unreaſonableneſs of ſuch a kind of *implicite Faith*, the unſuitableneſs of it to the nature of *Religion* in general, but more eſpecially the *Chriſtian* (whoſe great commendation is, that it puts men upon ſo much ſearching and enquiry into the truth of it) would tend more to the good of the *Chriſtian world*, than any of thoſe *ſoft* and *eaſie principles* which you ſeek to keep men in *obedience* by, and that I am afraid more to your *Church* than to *Chriſt*. Why then ſuch a Doctrine ſhould cauſe *needleſs gripes and tortures of ſpirit*, I cannot imagine: it muſt certainly be a great confirmation to the *mind* of any good man to ſee ſtill further *reaſon* for his *Faith*, by which it grows more radicated and confirmed. Or would you have a man diſquiet himſelf, becauſe he is not ſtill a Child? much ſuch a kind of thing this is, that a mans mind muſt be *tortured*, becauſe his *Faith* grows *ſtronger*; for we aſſert that there are *degrees* in Faith; which you who make all Faith *Infallible* cannot do, unleſs you ſuppoſe an *Infallible thing* may grow more *Infallible*. And if all true Faith be *Infallible*, how can men pray for the *increaſe of Faith*, unleſs they pray for the increaſe of

their *Infallibility*; which is a prayer, I ſuppoſe, not many in your *Church* are allowed to make, for then what becomes of your *Popes prerogative*, when not only every one among you is ſuppoſed to be *Infallible*, but hopes as well as prays to be more *Infallible*, which is more than your *Pope* or your *Church* dares pretend to.

But whether Doctrine tends more to *inward gripes* and *tortures of ſpirit*, yours or ours, let any reaſonable man judge; for we aſſert that *true Faith* is capable of *degrees* of *augmentation*, but you aſſert that there is no *Divine Faith* but what is *Infallible*; when therefore men by reflection upon themſelves are ſo far from finding ſuch an *Infallibility* in their *aſſent*, that they combate with many *doubts* and *fears*, as we ſee the *Apoſtles* did even after the *reſurrection of Chriſt*; you muſt pronounce that the *Apoſtles* when they queſtioned *Chriſts reſurrection* from the dead had no *Divine Faith* at all: for it is
Mark 16. 14. plain they were far from an *Infallible aſſent* to it, *when Chriſt upbraided them with their unbelief and hardneſs of heart, becauſe they believed not them which had ſeen him after he was riſen.* Were they Infallible in their *aſſent* then or no? I hope you will not contradict Chriſt ſo much as to ſay ſo? or had they no *Divine Faith* then at all? what not St. *Peter*, for whom *Chriſt* prayed that his *Faith ſhould not fail*, and from the *indefectibility* of whoſe Faith you derive that of the *Pope?* (but here you may ſee what a certain Foundation you have for it, when it is ſo apparent here, that S. *Peter*'s *Faith* did fail, and that as to ſo important *an Article of Faith*, as *Chriſt's own Reſurrection*; for certainly, S. *Peter* was one of the eleven.) Nay, Doth not *Chriſt upbraid* them for their *unbelief, in not believing them that had ſeen him after he was riſen?* We ſee then, *Chriſt* chides them for not reſolving their *faith* into a humane and moral Teſtimony; If you had been there, no doubt you muſt have told him, *He was miſtaken in the nature of faith, which could reſt on nothing but an infallible Teſtimony; and unleſs he ſhewed you by ſufficient Motives, that thoſe perſons who ſaw him riſen, were infallible, for all his haſte you were not bound to believe him.* But, whether Chriſt or you be the more infallible, judge you. We ſee our *Bleſſed Saviour* requires no more *Aſſent*, than the *nature* of the thing will bear; nay, he upbraids thoſe who will not believe upon *Moral and Humane Teſtimony*; but you ſay juſt the contrary, as though you were reſolved to contradict him: But that is ſufficient Argument to all *Chriſtians*, of the falſity and folly of your Doctrine, which tends to no other end, but to make all conſidering men *Scepticks*, or *Atheiſts*. For, when you lay it down as a certain Maxim, that no *faith* can be *Divine*, but what is *infallible*; and they find no ſuch *Infallibility* in the grounds or the nature of mens *Aſſent*, What then follows, but thoſe worſt ſort of *gripes and tortures*, ſuch as argue an inward *Convulſion* of mind, and bring men to a greater Queſtion, Whether there be any ſuch thing, as that you call true *Divine faith*, in the world? You go on with your *Catechumen's diſcourſe*, who muſt ſuppoſe, *Either that the Church taught, that he was to believe Scripture infallible, upon her own infallible Teſtimony, or not; If ſo, then he reflects, that this Church hath plainly deceived him, and all others, who believed upon that Suppoſition, and ſo expoſed them all to the hazard of eternal damnation; and*
P. 75, 76. *therefore was no True Church, but a deceiver. From whence* (ſay you) *he gathers, that her recommendation of Scripture, is as much as nothing, and ſo at laſt, is left to the ſole Letter of Scripture, and ſo muſt gather from thence its Authority, or there can be no means left him on the Biſhop's own Principles, to believe infallibly that Scripture is Divine, and the True Word of God.* This diſcourſe of yours conſiſts of three Abſurdities, which will follow upon one of your Churches queſtioning her Infallibility. 1. *That then your Church will be guilty of Impoſture.* 2. *Then the Churches Teſtimony ſignifies nothing.* 3. *That then the ſole Letter of Scripture muſt aſſure men of its Divine Authority.*

For

For the *first*, I muſt confeſs him whom before you ſuppoſed a *Child*, to be now grown to years of underſtanding, ſince he doth ſo wiſely reflect on himſelf, as to your *Churches groſs Impoſture*, in her pretence of *Infallibility*; and, no doubt, it is one of the *greateſt* which hath been known in the *Chriſtian world*, which you cannot your ſelf deny, ſuppoſing that it be not true that ſhe is *infallible*. For, Can there be any higher *cheat* in the world, than under a pretence of *Infallibility*, to impoſe things upon mens *faith*, which are contrary to the *Senſe* and *Reaſon* of mankind, to keep them from that inward ſatisfaction, which their ſouls might find from a ſerious conſideration of the *excellent nature* of *Chriſtian Religion*, and a diligent *practice* of it, to contradict thereby the very ſcope of *Chriſtianity*, which *Courts* our eſteem, by offering it ſelf to the faireſt tryal; when, I ſay, under this pretence *Chriſtian Religion* is apparently diſhonoured, the welfare of mens ſouls hindered, and the greateſt corruptions obtruded, without poſſibility of amendment of them, excuſe your *Church* from *Impoſture* if you can; for my part, I cannot, nor any one elſe who throughly conſiders it. For the *ſecond*; it will follow indeed, that the Teſtimony of your *Church* is as much as nothing, as to any *infallible foundation of faith*; but yet it may be of great *uſe* for conveying *Univerſal Tradition* to us, and ſo by that *delivering* the *Scripture* into our hands, as the *infallible rule of faith*. To the *Third*; it by no means follows, that there is nothing but the *ſole Letter of Scripture* left to convince us of the *Divine Authority of Scripture*; I hope the *working Miracles*, *fulfilling Prophecies*, the *nature* and *reaſonableneſs of the Doctrine of Scriptures*, are all left beſides the bare letter of Scripture; and theſe, we ſay, are ſufficient to make us believe, that the Scripture contains the infallible Word of God.

Now your *profound Chriſtian* begins to reflect on the *Biſhops way, which is* (ſay you) *That the Teſtimony of the Church is humane and fallible, and that the belief of the Scripture reſts upon the Scripture it ſelf.* But, it will be more to our purpoſe, to hear the *Biſhop* deliver his own mind, than to hear you ſo lamely deliver it; which, in ſhort, he ſumms up thus. *A man is probably led by the Authority of the preſent Church, as by the firſt informing, inducing, perſwading means, to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God: But, when he hath ſtudied, conſidered, and compared this Word with its ſelf, and with other writings, with the help of ordinary grace, and a mind morally induced, and reaſonably perſwaded by the voice of the Church, the Scripture then gives greater, and higher Reaſons of Credibility to it ſelf, than Tradition alone could give. And then, he that believes, reſolves his laſt and full Aſſent, that Scripture is of Divine Authority, into internal Arguments found in the Letter it ſelf, though found by the help of Tradition without, and Grace within.* This is the ſubſtance of his *Lordſhip*'s Opinion, againſt which we ſhall now conſider what your Diſcourſer hath to object. §. 15. P. 83.

1. The *firſt*, is from the caſe of *ignorant and illiterate perſons; ſuch, who either through want of learning could not read the Scripture, and examine, or elſe made little uſe of it, becauſe they ſuppoſed they might have infallible faith without it; What then becomes of millions of ſuch ſouls, both in former and preſent times?* To this I anſwer; Although the *Ignorance* and careleſneſs of men in a matter of ſo great conſequence, be ſo great in all *ages*, as is not to be juſtified, becauſe all men ought to endeavour after the higheſt wayes of *ſatisfaction*, in a matter ſo nearly concerning them (and it is none of the leaſt things to be blamed in your Church, that ſhe doth ſo much countenance this ignorance, and neglect of the *Scripture*) yet for ſuch perſons, who either morally, or invincibly, are hindred from this capacity of examining *Scripture*, there may be ſufficient means for their *Faith* to be built upon. For, although ſuch illiterate perſons cannot themſelves ſee, and P. 76.

read

read the *Scripture*, yet, as many as do believe, do receive the *Doctrine* of it, by that *sense* by which *Faith* is conveyed, that is, *Hearing*; and by that means they have so great *certainty*, as excludes all *doubting*, that such *Doctrines*, and such *matters of fact*, are contained in these *Books*, by which they come to the understanding of the nature of this *Doctrine*, and are capable of judging concerning the *Divinity* of it. For the *Light* spoken of in *Scripture*, is not a *Light* to the *eye*, but to the *mind*; now the *mind* is capable of this *Light*, as well by the *ear*, as by the *eyes*. The case then of such *honest illiterate persons*, as are not capable of reading *Scripture*, but diligently and devoutly hear it read to them, is much of the same nature with those who heard the *Apostles* preach this *Doctrine* before it was writ. For, whatever was an Argument to such to believe the *Apostles* in what they spake, becomes an Argument to such who hear the same things, which are certainly conveyed to us by an *unquestionable Tradition*: So that nothing hinders, but such illiterate persons may resolve their *Faith* into the same *Doctrine* and *Motives* which others do, only those are conveyed to them by the *ear*, which are conveyed to others by the *eyes*. But, if you suppose persons so rude and illiterate, as not to understand any thing, but that they are to believe as the *Church* believes; do you, if you can, resolve their *Faith* for them; for my part, *I cannot*, and am so far from it, that I have no reason to *believe* they can have any.

2. The *second* thing objected by your discourser is, *That if the Church's judgement be fallible, then much more ones own judgement is fallible. And therefore, if, notwithstanding all the care and pains taken by the Doctors of the Church, their perswasion was only humane and fallible; what reason hath any particular person to say, That he is divinely and infallibly certain by his reading the Scripture, that it is Divine Truth?* But, 1. Is there no difference between the *Churches Perswasion*, and the *Churches Tradition?* Doth the *Bishop* deny, but the perswasion of the *Doctors* of the *Church*, is as *infallible*, as that of any particular person? But this he denies, that they can derive that *Infallibility* of the *grounds* of their *Perswasion* into their *Tradition*, so as those who are to receive it on their Testimony, may be competent Judges of it. May we not then suppose their Tradition to be *humane* and *fallible*, whose perswasion of what they deliver, is established on *infallible grounds?* As a *Mathematician* is demonstratively convinced himself of the Truth of any particular *Problem*; but, if he bids another *believe* it on his *Testimony*, the other thereby hath no *demonstrative evidence* of the *Truth* of it, but only so great *moral evidence*, as the *Testimony* of that person carries along with it. The case is the same here: Suppose those persons in the *Church* in every *Age* of it, have to themselves *infallible evidence* of the *Divinity* of the *Scripture*, yet when they are to deliver this to be believed by others, unless their *Testimony* hath *infallible evidence* in it, men can never have more than *humane* or *moral certainty* of it. 2. It doth not at all follow, that if the *Testimony* of the *Church* be *fallible*, no particular person can be *infallibly assured* of the *Divinity* of the *Scripture*, unless this assurance did wholly depend upon that *Testimony*; indeed, if it did so, the Argument would hold, but otherwise it doth not at all. Now, you know, the *Bishop* denies that the *Faith* of any particular *person* doth rest upon the judgement of the *Church*; only he saith, This may be a *Motive* and *Inducement* to men, to consider further; but that which they rely upon, is, that *rational evidence* which appears in the *Scripture* it self.

3. He goes on, and argues against this use of Tradition, thus, *If the Light of the Scripture be insufficient to shew it self, unless it be introduced by the recommendation of the Church; How came* Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Husse, *&c. to discover this Light in it, seeing they rejected the Authority of all visible Churches in the world*, &c?

Sure

Sure your Diſcourſer was not very profound in this, that could not diſtinguiſh between the *Authority of Univerſal Tradition*, and *the Authority of the preſent viſible Church*, or between the *Teſtimony* of the *Church*, and the *Authority* of it. Shew us where *Luther*, *Calvin*, &c. did ever reject the *Authority* of an *uncontrouled Univerſal Tradition*, ſuch as that here mentioned concerning the *Scriptures being the Word of God*: Shew us where they deny that *Uſe* of the Teſtimony of thoſe *Churches*, whoſe Authority in impoſing *matters of Faith* they denied, which his *Lordſhip* aſſerts, *viz.* to be a means to introduce men to the knowledge and belief of the *Scriptures*; and, unleſs you ſhew this, you do nothing.

4. He argues againſt that *Light* in Scripture, *becauſe it is not ſufficient to diſtinguiſh Canonical Books from ſuch as are not ſo*; *For* (ſayes he) *Had not the Ancient Primitive Fathers in the firſt three hundred years, as much reaſon and ability to find this Light in Scripture, as any particular perſon? Yet many Books which do appear to us to be God's Word, by their Light, did not appear to be ſo to them by it, till they were declared ſuch by the Catholick Church.* I anſwer, 1. Where doth his *Lordſhip* ever ſay, or pretend, that any perſon, by the *Light* contained in the *Books*, can diſtinguiſh *Books* that are *Canonical*, from ſuch as are not? All that can be diſcovered, as to particular *Books* in queſtion, is, the examination of the *Doctrine* contained in them by the *ſeries* of that, which is in the unqueſtionable Books; for, we know, that *God* can never ſpeak *contradictions*: but ſtill this will only ſerve to exclude ſuch *Books* as contain things contrary, but not to admit all which have no *Doctrine* contrary to *Scripture*. 2. The reaſon why the *Primitive Fathers* queſtioned any *Books* that we do not, was not becauſe they could not diſcover that *Light* in them, which we do; for neither can we diſcover ſo much *Light* in any particular Book, as meerly from thence to ſay, It is *Canonical*; but there was not ſufficient *evidence* then appearing to them, that thoſe *Copies* did proceed from *Apoſtolical perſons*; and this was therefore only an Argument of that commendable care and caution which was in them, leſt any Book ſhould paſs for *Canonical*, which was not really ſo. 3. When the *Catholick Church* declared any controverted Book to be *Canonical*; Did not the *Church* then ſee as much Light in it as we do? but that *Light* which both the *Church* and we diſcover, is not a diſcriminating *Internal Light*, but an *External Evidence* from the ſufficiency, and validity of *Teſtimony*. And ſuch we have for the *Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament*; and therefore you have no cauſe to quarrel with us, *for receiving them from the Jewiſh Synagogue*; For who, I pray, are ſo competent witneſſes of what is delivered, as they who received it? and the *Apoſtle* tells us, *That to the Jews were committed the Oracles of God.*

5. Hence your diſcourſing *Chriſtian* argues, *That if one take up the Scripture on the account of Tradition, then, if one ſhould deny S.* Matthew's *Goſpel to be the written Word of God, he could not be accounted an Heretick, becauſe it was not ſufficiently propounded to him to be God's Word.* Whether ſuch a perſon may be accounted a *Heretick* in your ſenſe, or no, I am ſure he is in S. *Paul*'s, becauſe αὐτοκατάκριτος, *ſelf-condemned*, and that for the very contrary reaſon to what you give, *becauſe this is ſufficiently propounded to him.* I pray, tell me, What way you would have ſuch a thing *ſufficiently propounded* as a *matter* to be believed, that this is not propounded in? Would you have an unqueſtionable evidence, that this was writ by one of *Chriſt's Apoſtles*, called S. *Matthew*? ſo you have. Would you have all the *Churches* of *Chriſt* agreed in this *Teſtimony* in all *Ages* from the *Apoſtles* times? ſo you have. Would you have it delivered to you by the Teſtimony of the *preſent Church*? ſo you have. What then is, or can be wanting, in order to a *Propoſition* of it to be believed? Why, forſooth, ſome

infallible,

infallible, authoritative ſentence of the preſent Church, which ſhall make this an Object of Faith. See what a different mould ſome mens minds are of from others! For my part, ſhould I ſee, or hear any *Church* in the world, undertaking ſuch an office as that, I ſhould be ſo far from thinking it more ſufficiently propounded by it, that I ſhould not ſcruple to charge it with the greateſt preſumption and arrogance that may be. For, on what account can it poſſibly be a thing credible to me, that S. *Matthew's Goſpel* contains *God's written Word* any further, than it is evident that the *perſon* who wrote it, was one choſen by *Chriſt*, to deliver the ſumm of his proceedings, as an *Apoſtle*, to the world? And therefore I have no reaſon to think, he would deceive men in what he ſpake or writ: The only Queſtion then is, How I ſhould know this is no counterfeit name, but that S. *Matthew* writ it? Let us conſider, what poſſible means there are to be aſſured of it. I cannot imagine any but theſe two; Either that *God* ſhould immediately reveal it either to my ſelf, or to ſome *Church* to propound it to me; or elſe, that I am to believe thoſe *perſons* who firſt received thoſe *Copies* from his hands, by whoſe means they were diſperſed abroad in the world, from whence they are conveyed by an *unqueſtionable Tradition* down to us. Of theſe two, chuſe whether you pleaſe: if the *firſt*, then particular *immediate Revelations* are neceſſary to particular perſons, to have ſuch an *Object of Faith* ſufficiently propounded to them, and then the *Church* cannot authoritatively pronounce any *Books of Scripture* to be *Canonical*, without immediate Revelation to her, that this Book was written by ſuch a perſon, who was *divinely aſſiſted* in the writing of it. And this you have denied before to belong to the *Church*. If you take up with the *ſecond*, the *unqueſtionable Teſtimony of all Ages, ſince the Apoſtles*; then judge you whether S. *Matthew's Goſpel* be not ſufficiently propounded to be believed; and conſequently, Whether any one who ſhould queſtion or deny it, be not guilty of the greateſt pievifhneſs and obſtinacy imaginable. From hence we may ſee, with what ſuperfluity of
P. 77. diſcretion the next words came from you; *Nay, hence it follows, that even our bleſſed Saviour, who is wiſdom it ſelf, would have been eſteemed by all the world, not a wiſe Law-giver, but a meer* Ignoramus *and Impoſtor.* For ſhame, man, forbear ſuch inſolent expreſſions for the future, and repent of theſe. For, Muſt *Chriſt's Wiſdom* be called in queſtion, and he liable to be accounted an *Ignoramus and Impoſtor*, if he doth not make your *Church Infallible?* I have told you often before, how much your *Doctrine of Infallibility* tends to *Atheiſm*, and now you ſpeak out. For the meaning of your words plainly, is, *If God hath not entruſted your Church with a full and abſolute power to declare what is his will, and what not, Chriſt was an* Ignoramus *and Impoſtor.* For that is the ſubſtance of your next words. *For, had he not framed, think you, a ſtrange and Chimerical Common-wealth, were it alone deſtitute of a full and abſolute power, to give an authentical and unqueſtionable declaration, which is the true and genuine Law?* Now, it is evident from all your diſcourſe foregoing, you only plead for this full and abſolute power in *your Church*; and judge you then what the conſequence is (to all thoſe who cannot ſee any ſhadow of reaſon for this your pretended Infallibility) neither more nor leſs, than that *Chriſts is liable to be accounted by all the world an* Ignoramus *and Impoſtor:* Nay, that they are *fools*, who account him not ſo; if they do not believe this *preſent Infallibility of your Church; for it is apparent* (ſay you) *that he hath ordered his Common-wealth worſe than ever any one did.* And now let any that conſider what pitiful ſilly proofs you have produced for this preſent Infallibility, (nay, ſuch, that I am confident, that you cannot think your ſelf you have in the leaſt meaſure proved it) then judge, what thoughts of *Chriſt* you are forced to entertain your ſelf upon your own Argument, *viz. as of an Ignoramus and Impoſtor.* Hath not your *Infallibility*

led

led you now a fine dance? Is not this the way to make *Faith certain*, and to reclaim *Atheists?* I had thought it had been enough for your *Canoniſts*, to have charged *Chriſt with indiſcretion*, if he had not left a *Vicar* on earth; but now, it ſeems, the *profound Philoſophers*, *learned Divines*, and *expert Hiſtorians* (for ſuch a one, you told us, your diſcourſing *Chriſtian* was ſuppoſed by you to be in whoſe name theſe words are ſpoken) do charge *Chriſt* with folly and impoſture, if he hath not made your *Church infallible*. For, ſhift it off as you can, you cannot deny but that muſt be the aim of theſe words: for you are proving the neceſſity of an *infallible Declaration* by the *preſent Church*, in order to a *ſufficient Propoſition* of the *Scripture* to be *believed*; and it is notorious you never pretend that any *Church* hath any ſhare in this *Infallibility*, but your own; And therefore the conſequence unavoidably follows, that ſince there can be no *ſufficient Propoſition*, that the *Scripture* is to be believed without this *infallible Teſtimony*; ſince no *Church* pretends to this *Infallibility*, but *yours*; ſince, without ſuch proviſion for the *Church*, *Chriſt would have been eſteemed by all the world not a wiſe Law-giver, but a meer* Ignoramus *and Impoſtor*; What then follows, but that if your *Church* be not *infallible*, He muſt be accounted ſo? And if you dread not theſe conſequences; I hope all *Chriſtians* do, and have never the better thoughts of your *Infallibility* for them.

6. Let us ſee, how he comes cloſer to the matter it ſelf; and examines how *this Light ſhould be Infallible, and Divine, ſuppoſing the Churches Teſtimony to be humane and fallible*. The ſubſtance of which, is this, *If the Church* P. 77. *may err, we may ſuppoſe ſhe hath erred in teſtifying ſome Books to be Gods Word; in that caſe, Books that were not Gods Word, would be equally recommended with thoſe that were: And that it would be impoſſible for any particular perſon, by reading them, to diſtinguiſh the one from the other.* To which I anſwer 1. It is all one with you to ſuppoſe a *Church fallible*, and ſuppoſe that *ſhe hath erred*. To put a caſe of a like nature. The Teſtimony of all mankind is *fallible*; May you therefore ſuppoſe that all mankind hath *erred* in ſomething they are agreed in? The Teſtimony of all thoſe perſons who have ſeen *Rome*, is fallible; May I therefore queſtion whether they were not all deceived? But of this afterwards. 2. When you ſpeak of the *Church erring*, Do you mean the *Church in every Age ſince Chriſts Coming, concerning all the Books of Scripture?* or, *the preſent Church, concerning only ſome Books of Scripture?* If you ſuppoſe, the *Church* of *all Ages* ſhould be deceived, you muſt ſuppoſe ſome, who were *infallible*, ſhould *be deceived*; thoſe were the *Apoſtles* in writing and delivering their *Books* to the *Churches* of their time; or elſe you muſt ſuppoſe all the *Apoſtolical Churches* deceived in taking thoſe *Books* to have come from the *Apoſtles*, which did not; And is not this a congruous Suppoſition? Well then, if it be unreaſonable to ſuppoſe the *Apoſtolical Churches* deceived, and impoſſible to imagine the *Apoſtles* deceived, in ſaying, They writ what they did not: Where then muſt ſuch an univerſal errour as this, come in? Or, Is it not equally unreaſonable to ſuppoſe all the *Chriſtian Churches* in the world ſhould be deceived, without any queſtioning of ſuch a deceit, ſuppoſing but the goodneſs and common providence of *God* in preſerving ſuch records, and the moral induſtry uſed by *Chriſtians*, in a matter of ſuch importance? It is therefore a very abſurd and unreaſonable thing to imagine, *That all the Churches of Chriſt, in all Ages, ſhould err in receiving all the Books of Scripture*. Let us then ſee, as to the preſent *Churches* erring, as to *particular Books*: 1. Either the *Records* of former *Ages* are left to judge by, or no? If they be, as certainly they are, we thereby ſee a way to correct the *errour* of the *preſent Church*, by appealing to theſe records of the *Church* in former times? if they be not left, how could any of theſe *Books* be derived from *Apoſtolical Tradition*, when we have no means to *trace* ſuch a *Tradition* by? 2. Suppoſing only ſome *Books* queſti-

oned, or that the *preſent Church* errs only in ſome particular Books; then it appears that there remains a far greater number of ſuch *Books*, whoſe Authority we have no reaſon at all to queſtion, and by comparing the other with theſe we may eaſily prevent any very dangerous errour; for if they contain any *Doctrine* contrary to the former, we have no reaſon to believe them; if they do not, there can be no very dangerous *errour* in admitting them. Thus you ſee how eaſily this *errour* is prevented ſuppoſing the *Churches* teſtimony not only fallible, but that it alſo ſhould actually *err* in delivering ſome *Books* for *Canonical*, which are not ſo: but ſuppoſing a *Church* pretends to be *Infallible* and is believed to be ſo, and yet doth actually *err* in delivering the *Canon* of *Scripture*, what remedy is there then? for while we look on the *Churches* teſtimony as *fallible*, there is ſcope and liberty left for enquiry and further *ſatisfaction*, but if it be looked on as *Infallible*, all that believe it to be ſo are left under an impoſſibility of eſcaping that *errour* which ſhe is guilty of. And the more dangerous ſuch an errour is, the worſe the condition is of all ſuch who believe the *Churches Teſtimony* Infallible. Now this is that we juſtly charge your Church with, that while ſhe pretends to *Infallibility*, ſhe hath actually *erred* in delivering ſuch *Books* for *Canonical* which are not ſo, as hath been abundantly manifeſted by the Worthies of our Church. The remainder of this diſcourſe of yours concerning knowing *Canonical Books by the light in them*, is vacated by our preſent anſwer; and ſo is the other concerning *Apoſtolical traditions* by our former, upon that ſubject. As to that Scruple, *How the light ſhould be Infallible and Divine, when the Churches Teſtimony is humane and fallible*, it ſignifies nothing unleſs the light be only ſuppoſed to riſe from the *Teſtimony*, which his Lordſhip denies.

§. 16. 7. *The judgement of the Fathers is enquired into* concerning the preſent ſubject; out of whom only *Irenæus* and St. *Auguſtin* are produced, as affirming in many places, *That the Tradition of the Church is ſufficient to found Chriſtian Faith even without Scripture, and that for ſome hundreds of years after the Canon of Scripture was written.* But muſt we ſtand only to the judgement of theſe two concerning the ſenſe of the Primitive *Church* in this preſent Controverſie? We may eaſily know the judgement of the *Fathers*, if two ſuch lame Citations as theſe are, are ſufficient to diſcover it. But your unhappineſs is great in whatever you undertake: If you meddle with *reaſon*, you ſoon find how little it *becomes* you: if you fly to the *Fathers*, they prove the greateſt *witneſſes* againſt you; as will appear in this debate, if we firſt examine the *citations* you produce, and then ſhew how fully and clearly theſe very *perſons* whom you have picked out of all the *Chorus* do deliver themſelves againſt you. The firſt *citation* is that known one, out of *Irenæus*, concerning thoſe *barbarous nations who believed without the Scriptures, adhering to the Tradition of the Apoſtles, having ſalvation written without Paper and Ink.* But what it is you would hence infer, I cannot imagine, unleſs it be one of theſe two things; 1. That *if we had no Scriptures left us, it would be neceſſary for us to believe on the account of Apoſtolical Tradition*; that is, that the grounds of our Faith were ſo clear and evident of themſelves, that though they had never been written, yet if they had been conveyed by an unqueſtionable Tradition from the *Apoſtles*, there had lain an obligation on us to believe the *Doctrine of Chriſt*. But, is this our caſe? hath not *God* infinitely better provided for us, when (as your other witneſs St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks) *Whatever our Saviour would have us read of his actions or ſpeeches, he commanded his Apoſtles and Diſciples as his hands to write.* Chriſtian Religion is now

Iren. l. 3. c. 4. *Quid autem, ſi neque Apoſtoli quidem ſcripturas reliquiſſent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem ſequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Eccleſias? Cui ordinationi aſſentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, qui in Chriſtum credunt, ſine chartâ & atramento ſcriptam habentes ſalutem, & veterem traditionem cuſtodientes.*

Quicquid Servator de ſuis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc ſcribendum illis tanquam ſuis manibus imperavit. De Conſenſ. Evang. l. 1. c. ult.

now no *Cabala* to us, *God* hath *conſigned* his will over to us, by *Codicils* of his own appointing; and muſt we then be now in the like caſe, as if his Will had never been written at all? 2. But what if the *barbarous Nations did believe without the Books of Scripture*; what doth that prove, but only this; that there may be ſufficient reaſon to believe in *Chriſt* where the *Scriptures* are not known? Is that contrary to us who ſay, *The laſt reſolution of Faith* is into the *Doctrine of Chriſt* as atteſted by *God*: now if that *atteſtation* be ſufficiently conveyed, there is an obligation to believe; but withal we ſay, that *to us who enjoy the Scriptures* as delivered down to us, the only certain and infallible *conveyance* of *Gods Word* to us is by them. So that the whole *Chriſtian world* is obliged to you for your civil compariſon of them, with thoſe *Barbarians* who either enjoyed not the *Scriptures*, or in probability were not able to make uſe of them, as being probably ignorant of the *uſe of letters*. 3. Doth *Irenæus* in theſe words ſay, that even theſe *Barbarians* did believe upon the *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church*? No; he mentions no ſuch thing, but that they believed that *Tradition of Doctrine* which was delivered them from the *Apoſtles*. I ask you then; Suppoſe at that time ſome *honeſt* but *fallible perſons* ſhould have gone into *Scythia*, or ſome ſuch *barbarous places*, and delivered the *Doctrine of the Goſpel*, and atteſting the *matters of fact* as being *eye-witneſſes of Chriſts Miracles, Death, and Reſurrection*, whether would theſe *Barbarians* have been bound to believe or no? If not, then for all I know, *Infidelity* is a very excuſable ſin; If they were, I pray tell me what it was their *Faith* was reſolved into; was it an infallible teſtimony of fallible men? And the ſame caſe is, of ſuch who ſhould preach the ſame *Doctrine* from theſe *eye-witneſſes* in another *Generation*, and ſo on; for although there might be no reaſon to queſtion their teſtimony, yet I ſuppoſe you will not ſay, It is *Infallible?* ſo that ſtill this makes nothing for your purpoſe. 4. Who better underſtood *Irenæus* his mind, than *himſelf?* let us therefore ſee what he elſewhere tells us *is the foundation and pillar of our Faith who have received the Scriptures*. Doth not he tell us, but three Chapters before this, *That we have received the method or Doctrine of our Salvation, from thoſe perſons who preached it; which by Gods command they after delivered in the Scriptures, which were to be the foundation and pillar of our Faith?* Could any thing be more fully ſpoken to our purpoſe than this is? Whereby he ſhews us, now the *Scriptures* are conſigned unto us, what that is which our Faith muſt ſtand upon: not the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, but that *Word of God* which is delivered to us. This therefore he elſewhere calls the *Unmovable Canon of our Faith*, as S. *Auguſtine* calls it *Divinam ſtateram, the Divine ballance* we muſt weigh the grounds of our Belief in.

Non per alios diſpoſitionem ſalutis noſtræ cognovimus, quàm per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, poſtea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei noſtræ futurum. Iren. l. 3. cap. 1.

Irenæus lib. 4. cap. 69. Auguſtin 2. cont. Donat. cap. 7.

By which we may gueſs, what little relief you are like to have from your ſecond witneſs St. *Auguſtin*. Two citations you produce out of him; and, I queſtion not, but to make it appear, that neither of thoſe Teſtimonies do make for you; and thoſe very Books afford us ſufficient againſt you.

The firſt is out of his *Books of Chriſtian Doctrine*, which leſt we ſhould think not pertinent, you care not to produce it; but we muſt. *A man who ſtrengthens himſelf with Faith, Hope, and Charity, and retains them unſhaken, needs not the Scriptures, but only to inſtruct others, for by theſe three, many live without Books in a deſart.* His meaning is, that he who hath a principle of Divine life within him, which diſcovers it ſelf in the exerciſe of thoſe three Graces, needs not ſo much the *external precepts*, becauſe that inward principle will carry him to actions ſuitable to it;

Homo itaq; fide, ſpe, & charitate ſubnixus, eaq; inconcuſſe retinens, non indiget ſcripturis niſi ad alios inſtruendos. Itaq; multi per hec tria, etiam inſa'itudine ſine codicibus vivunt. De Doctr. Chriſtianâ l. 1. c. p. 39.

only, for convincing or inſtructing others, theſe *Books* are continually uſeful; but for themſelves, thoſe good men who firſt through the fury of their perſecution were driven, and after others, who, in imitation of that piety they ſhewed there, did withdraw into remote places, did live in the exerciſe of their *Religion* without them! But what is there in all this to infer, that not the *Scriptures* but the Infallibility of the *Church* is the *foundation of Faith?* Doth St. *Auguſtine* ſuppoſe that men may have *Faith, Hope, and Charity*, without *believing:* or that men may *believe* without the *Scriptures*, when in the precedent Chapter he hath this remarkable expreſſion concerning *Faith, That it will ſoon ſtumble, if the Authority of the ſacred Scriptures be weakned:* and doth not this imply that Faith ſtands on the Authority of the *Scriptures* as its proper foundation? But this were pardonable, if the very deſign of all that Treatiſe did not ſo evidently refute all your *pretenſions*, as nothing can do it more effectually. For can you poſſibly perſwade any reaſonable man to think, that St. *Auguſtine* dreamt of any ſuch thing, as the *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church* to be the *ground of Faith*, who when he purpoſely diſcourſeth concerning the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, the *principles* of it, and the beſt *means* to underſtand it, never ſo much as mentions any ſuch thing; but on the contrary directs to no other but thoſe you call *Moral and Fallible means?* For underſtanding the *principles of Chriſtian Doctrine*, he ſhews us the ſeveral *natures* of things, ſome to be enjoyed, ſome to be uſed, and others both: that the main thing we are to enjoy is *God*, and therefore begins with him as our laſt end in whom our happineſs lies, and then ſhews the means to come to this enjoyment of *God*, by explaining the *principles of Faith* and the efficacy of it. In his ſecond *Book* he ſhews how we may come to the ſenſe of *Scripture*, and firſt diſcovers the nature of *ſigns* which repreſent *things*, and of *letters* which are *ſigns* of words, and ſince there are diverſities of *tongues*, how neceſſary the tranſlation of *Scripture* is into them (a good citation for you to juſtifie your Bibles and Prayers in an unknown language with) and then ſhews what great reaſon there was, why there ſhould be ſome *doubtful* and *obſcure places* left in Scripture, *to conquer our pride by induſtry, and to keep the underſtanding from nauſeating, which commonly ſlights things that are eaſily underſtood.* Then ſhews what preparation and diſpoſition of ſoul is requiſite for Divine wiſdome, and ſo comes to the underſtanding the Scriptures: for which, firſt is requiſite a ſerious and diligent reading of them; in order to which he muſt carefully diſtinguiſh ſuch as are *Canonical* from ſuch as are not; and for judging of theſe, he never ſo much as mentions, much leſs ſends us to the *Infallible Teſtimony of the Roman Church*, but bids us follow *the Authority of the moſt Catholick Churches among which thoſe are, which are worthy to be call'd Apoſtolical Sees, and had Epiſtles ſent to them.* What Authority then had the *Church* of *Rome* to judge of *Canonical Scriptures*, more than *Epheſus, Philippi, Theſſalonica*, &c. To be ſure then, St. *Auguſtin* was not of our Diſcourſers mind, as to the judgement of *Canonical Books:* and why ſhould he ſend men to thoſe *Churches* which received the *Epiſtles*, but that there they were like to meet with greater ſatisfaction as to the authenticalneſs of the *Copies* of thoſe *Epiſtles?* After this, he gives directions for underſtanding hard places, *Firſt by diligent reading and remembring the plaineſt places; for in them* (ſaith he) *are found all thoſe things which contain matters of Faith and Practice.* An excellent citation for you for ſeveral purpoſes, eſpecially when you would prove the *obſcurity of Scripture*, the *neceſſity of an Infalli-*

Titubabit autem fides, ſi diſcinavum ſcripturarum caritas auctoritas. De Doctr. Chriſt. l. 1. c. 38.

Ad edomandam labore ſuperbiam, & intellectum à faſtidio revocandam, cui facilè inteſtigata plerumq; viluerunt. l. 2. c. 6.

In Canonicis autem ſcripturis eccleſiarum catholicarum quamplurium auctoritatem ſequatur, inter quas ſanè illæ ſint, quæ Apoſtolicas ſedes habuerunt & epiſtolas accipere meruerunt. l. 2. c. 8.

In iis enim quæ aperte poſita in Scripturâ ſunt, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem, moreſq; vivendi. l. 2. c. 9.

Infallible Judge, or *your Doctrine of Fundamentals* out of St. *Auguſtin*. And then bids them compare obſcure and eaſie places together, to underſtand the *proprieties* of *words*, to get knowledge in the *Tongues*, to compare Verſions, Antecedents and Conſequents, to be skill'd in all humane Arts and Sciences; theſe and ſeveral other inſtructions to the ſame purpoſe are the ſcope of his following Books. Would any one now but *T. C.* have ventured ſo unluckily upon this Treatiſe of St. *Auguſtin* above all others, to prove the *Infallibility* of the *Churches Teſtimony* as neceſſary to *Faith* by? Could any *Proteſtant* have delivered his mind more punctually and plainly than he doth? And can you, or any one elſe that doth but look into that Book, imagine that S. *Auguſtin* ever imagined, that any ſuch thing ſhould ever be thought of in the world, as that the Teſtimony of the *Church of Rome* muſt be owned as the Infallible foundation of Faith, and the Infallible Interpreter of Scripture? But this it is, to converſe with the *Fathers* only by *retail*, as they are delivered out in *parcels* to you with *directions* upon them what *uſe* they are for, by *Bellarmin* and ſuch Artiſts as himſelf. This is, inſtead of *quoting* the *Fathers*, to *challenge* them; and you ſee they are not afraid to appear, though to your ſhame and confuſion.

But for all this you have a Reſerve in St. *Auguſtin* ſtill: let us ſee what quotation that is, which lies ſo in *Ambuſcado* behind the hedges, and is ſo loth to come out. There is good reaſon for ſo much *reſervedneſs*; for when we come to ſearch, we find only *buſhes* inſtead of *Souldiers*. I have throughly examined the place you refer us to, and cannot meet any thing the leaſt pertinent to your purpoſe, unleſs the queſtion of the *lawfulneſs of Hereticks Baptiſm*, prove your *Churches Teſtimony to be Infallible*. But it may be, it is but a venial miſtake of a Chapter or two, forward or backward, and there we may find it. Which when I look into, I cannot but ſuſpect that ſome *Proteſtant* had *trepanned* you into this *Book* and *place* of St. *Auguſtine*; there being ſcarce any Book or place in him more begirt with Arguments againſt you than this is. I was at firſt fearful you had quoted *Fathers at a peradventure*; but upon my further conſidering the place, I ſoon rectified that miſtake. I will therefore reckon you up ſome of the moſt probable Citations out of St. *Auguſtines* Books of *Baptiſm againſt the Donatiſts*, and chooſe which of them you pleaſe to prove the neceſſity of an *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church* as a foundation of Faith by? I ſuppoſe, that you intended is in the next Chapter but one following, where St. *Auguſtine* cites that paſſage of *Cyprian*, *That we ought to recur to the fountain*, i. e. *to Apoſtolical Tradition*, *and thence derive the channel into our own times*; *this*, ſaith St. Auguſtin, *is the beſt*, *and without doubt to be done*. No doubt you think you owe me great thanks for finding out ſo appoſite a place for you, ſo near that you intended; but, before we have done with it, you will ſee what little reaſon you have to thank me for it: The place you ſee is cited by St. *Auguſtin* out of *Cyprian* in whoſe Epiſtle it is, to *Pompeius* againſt *Stephanus Biſhop of Rome*: we therefore conſider, that it was *Stephen* who pleaded cuſtom and tradition, to which *Cyprian* replies, *Whence comes this Tradition, doth it deſcend from the Lords Authority, or from the Commands and Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, for thoſe things are to be done which are there written?* And again, *If it be commanded in the Goſpel, or the Epiſtles, and Acts of the Apoſtles, then let this holy Tradition be obſerved.* We ſee then what St. *Cyprian meant* by his *Apoſtolical Tradition*, not one Infallibly atteſted by the preſent Church, but that is clearly derived from *Scripture* as its fountain: and therefore brings in the foregoing words on purpoſe to correct the

De Baptiſm c. Donatiſt. l. 5. c. 24.

Quod autem nos admonet, ut ad fontem recurramus, i.e. ad Apoſtolicam traditionem, & inde canalem in noſtra tempora dirigamus, optimum eſt, & ſine dubitatione faciendum. l. 5. c. 26.

Cypr. ep. 74.

Unde traditio hæc, utrumne de Dominicâ authoritate deſcendens, an de Apoſtolorum mandatis & epiſtolis veniens? Ea enim eſſe facienda quæ ſcripta ſunt teſtatur, &c.
Si in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apoſtolorum epiſtolis aut Actibus invenitur, obſervetur etiam ſancta hæc traditio.

errours

errours of Traditions, that, *As when channels are diverted to a wrong course, we must have recourse to the fountain; so we must in all pretended Traditions of the Church, run up to the Scriptures as the fountain-head.* And whereas *Bellarmins* only shift to avoid this place of *Cyprian*, is, by saying that *Cyprian* argued *more errantium*, i. e. could not defend one errour but by another; see how different the judgements of St. *Augustine* and *Bellarmin* are about it: for St. *Augustin* is so far from blaming it in him, that he saith, *Optimum est & sine dubitatione faciendum*, i. e. *It was the best and most prudent course to prevent errours.* And in another place where he mentions that saying of *Cyprian*, *It is in vain for them to object Custom, who are overcome by Reason, as though custom were greater than truth; or as though that were not to be followed in spiritual things, which is revealed by the Holy Ghost. This, saith St.* Augustin, *is evidently true, because reason and truth is to be preferred before custom.* He doth not charge these sayings on him as *Bellarmin* doth, as part of his *errours*, but acknowledgeth them and disputes against his opinion out of those *principles.* And when before, the *Donatists* objected the authority of St. *Cyprian* in the point of *Rebaptization*, What kind of answer doth St. *Augustine* give them? the very same that any Protestant would give. *Who knows not that the sacred Canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament is contained within certain bounds; and ought so far to be preferr'd before the succeeding writings of Bishops, that of that alone we are not to doubt or call in question any thing therein written, whether it be true and right or no.* But, as he saith in the following words, *All the writings since the confirmation of the Canon of Scripture are lyable to dispute, and even Councils themselves to be examined and amended by Councils.* Think you then, that St. *Augustin* ever thought of a present *Infallibility* in the *Church?* or if he did, he expressed it in as odd a manner as ever I read: How easily might he have stopt the mouths of the *Donatists* with that one pretence of *Infallibility?* How impertinently doth he dispute through all those *Books*, if he had believed any such thing? It were easie to multiply the Citations out of other Books of St. *Austin*, to shew how much he attributed to *Scripture*, as the only rule of *Faith*; and consequently, how far from believing your Doctrine of Infallibility. But these may suffice to shew, how unhappily you light on these Books of St. *Augustine* for the proof of your opinion out of the *Fathers.*

Proinde, inquit, frustra quidam qui ratione vincuntur, Consuetudinem nobis objiciunt, quasi consuetudo major sit veritate; aut non id sit in spiritualibus sequendum quod in melius fuerit à Spiritu Sancto revelatum. Hoc planè verum est, quia ratio & veritas consuetudini præponenda est. Aug. de baptism. c. Donat. l. 4. c. 5.

Quis autem nesciat Sanctam Scripturam Canonicam, tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti certis suis terminis contineri, eamq; omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illâ omnino dubitari & disceptari non possit, utrum verum, vel utrum rectum sit, quicquid in eâ scriptum esse constiterit. l. 2. de bapt. c. Donat. cap. 3.

§. 18. The last thing your Discourser objects against his Lordships way, is, *If the Church be fallible in the Tradition of Scripture, how can I ever be Infallibly certain, that she hath not erred* de facto, *and defined some Book to be the Word of God, which really is not his Word?* To which I answer. If you mean by *Infallible certainty*, such a *certainty* as must have some *Infallible Testimony* for the ground of it, you beg the question: for I deny any such *Infallible Testimony* to be at all requisite for our believing the *Canon* of *Scripture*, and therefore you object that as an inconvenience, which I apprehend to be none at all. For I do not think it any absurdity to say, that I cannot believe upon some *Infallible Testimony*, that the *Church* hath not *erred* in defining the *Canon of Scripture.* If by *Infallible certainty* you mean such a *certainty* as absolutely excludes a *possibility of deception*; you would do well, first to shew how congruous this is to *humane nature* in this present state, before you make such a *certainty* so necessary for any act of humane understanding. But, if by *Infallible certainty* you mean only such as excludes all *possibility of reasonable doubting* upon the consideration of the validity and sufficiency of that *Testimony* I am to believe the *Canon* of *Scripture* upon; then I assert, that

upon

upon making the *Churches Teſtimony* to be fallible, it doth not at all follow, but that I may have ſo great a certainty as excludes the *poſſibility* of all *reaſonable doubting* concerning the *Canon of Scripture*. For when I ſuppoſe the *Churches Teſtimony fallible*, I do not thereby underſtand, as though there were *as great reaſon to ſuſpect her deceived, as not*, (nay, I ſay there can be no reaſon to ſuſpect her deceived); but by that I underſtand only this, that the *Church* hath not any *ſupernatural Infallibility* given her in delivering ſuch a *Teſtimony*, or that ſuch *Infallibility* muſt be the foundation of believing the thing ſo delivered. For whether I ſuppoſe your particular *Church of Rome*, or the *Catholick Church* to be *ſupernaturally Infallible* in her Traditions, there will be the ſame difficulty returning, and an equal impoſſibility of vindicating our *Faith* from the entanglements of a Circle. For ſtill the queſtion unavoidably returns, From whence I believe ſuch a *ſupernatural Infallibility* in the *Church?* For in that it is *ſupernatural* it muſt ſuppoſe ſome *promiſe* on which it depends, that *promiſe* muſt be ſomewhere extant, and that can be no where but in *Scripture*; therefore when I am asked, Why I believe the *Canon* of the *Scripture* to be true; if I anſwer, Becauſe the *Tradition* of the *Catholick Church* is *Infallible*, the queſtion preſently returns, Since humane nature is in it ſelf fallible, whence comes the *Church* to have this Infallibility? If I anſwer, By the *aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit*, I am preſently asked, Since no man by the light of nature and meer reaſon can be aſſured of this; how know you that you are not deceived in believing ſuch an *aſſiſtance?* If to this I anſwer, Becauſe *God* who is Infallible hath made this *promiſe* in his *Word*, I am driven again to the *firſt queſtion, How I know this to be Gods Word*, and muſt anſwer it as before, Upon the *infallible Teſtimony of the Catholick Church*. Thus we ſee, how impoſſible it is to avoid a *Circle* in the ſuppoſition of a *ſupernatural Infallibility* in the Churches Tradition. But, if no more be meant but a kind of *rational Infallibility* (though thoſe terms be not very proper) *i.e.* ſo *great evidence*, as, if I queſtion it, I may, upon equal grounds, queſtion every thing which mankind yields the *firmeſt Aſſent* to, becauſe I cannot imagine, that ſo great a part of the *wiſeſt*, and moſt conſiderative part of the world ſhould be ſo groſly deceived in a matter of ſuch moment (eſpecially ſuppoſing a *Divine Providence*) then I freely and heartily aſſert, We have ſuch a kind of *rational Infallibility*; or rather the higheſt degree of *actual Certainty* concerning the *Truth* of the *Canon of Scripture*; and that the *Catholick Church hath not* de facto *erred in defining it*. Thus I have followed your diſcourſing Chriſtian through all his doubts and perplexities, and upon the reſult, can find no ground at all either of doubting concerning the *Scripture*, or of believing the Teſtimony of your *Church*, or any, to be an *infallible ground of Faith*. Your next paſſage is, to tell us *how his Lordſhips Dedalian windings* (as you finely call them) *are diſintricated:* A happy man you are at ſquaring Circles, and getting out of *Labyrinths*. And thus it appears in the preſent caſe. For when his Lordſhip had ſaid, *That the Tradition of the Church is too weak, becauſe that is not abſolutely Divine*; you repeat over your already exploded Propoſition, that there may be *an infallible Teſtimony which is not abſolutely Divine*; which, when I have your faculty of writing things, which neither you, nor any one elſe can underſtand, I may admit of; but till then, I muſt humbly beg your pardon, as not being able to aſſent to any thing which I cannot underſtand, and have no reaſon to believe. And withal, contrary to your ſecond Anſwer, it appears, *That if the Teſtimony of the Primitive, were abſolutely Divine, becauſe infallible*, the *Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church*, muſt be *abſolutely Divine*, if it be *infallible*. P. 78.

The

§. 19. The rest of this Chapter is spent in the examining some by-citations of men of your own side chiefly, and therefore it is very little material as to the truth or falshood of the present Controversie; yet, because you seem to triumph so much assoon as you are off the main business, I shall briefly return an Answer to the substance of what you say. His *Lordship* having asserted
P. 81. n. 20. *the Tradition of the Primitive Apostolical Church to be Divine*, and *that the Church of* England *doth embrace that as much as any Church whatsoever*, withal adds, *That when S.* Augustine *said, I would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Church moved me; some of your own will not endure it should be understood, save of the Church in the time of the Apostles only; and some, of the Church in general, not excluding after Ages: but sure to include Christ and his Apostles.* In your Answer to this, you insult strangely over his *Lordship* in two things, *First, That he should say Some, and mention but one in his Margent.* 2. *That that One doth not say, what he cites out of him.*

Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret authoritas. Aug. l. 1. c. ep. fund. c. 5.

Ibid. n. 7. To the *first* I answer, you might easily observe, the use his *Lordship* makes of his *Margent*, is not so much to bring clear and distinct proofs of what he writes in his Book, but what hath some *reference* to what he there says: and therefore it was no absurdity for him to say in his Book indefinitely *some*, and yet in his Margent only to mention *Occham*. For, when his Lordship writ that, no doubt his mind was upon *others*, who asserted the same thing, though he did not *load* his Margent with them. And, that you may see, I have reason for what I say, I hope you will not suppose his Lordship unacquainted with the *Testimonies* of those of your side, who do in terms assert this. That I may therefore free you from all kind of suspicion; What think you of *Gerson*, when, speaking of the greater Authority of the *Primitive Church* than *of the present*: he adds, *And by this means we come to understand, what S.* Augustine *said, I would not believe the Gospel*, &c. *For there, saith he, he takes the Church for the Primitive Congregation of Believers, who saw and heard Christ, and were witnesses of what he did.* Is not this Testimony plain enough for you? But, besides this, we have another as evident, in whom are those very words, which his *Lordship*, by a lapse of memory, attributes to *Occham*: For *Durandus* plainly says, *That for what concerns the approbation of Scripture by the Church, it is understood only of the Church which was in the Apostles times, who were filled with the Holy Spirit, and withal, saw the Miracles of Christ, and heard his Doctrine; and on that account were convenient witnesses of all which Christ did, or taught, that by their Testimony, the Scripture containing the actions and speeches of Christ, might receive approbation.* Do you yet desire a Testimony more express and full, than this is, of one who doth understand the Church exclusively of all successive to the *Apostles*, when he had, just before, produced that known Testimony of S. *Augustine*? You see then, *the Bishop had some reason to say, Some of your Church asserted this to be S.* Augustine's *meaning*; and therefore your Instances of *some*, where but *one* is meant, are both impertinent and scurrilous. For, where it is evidently known, there was but *one*, it were a *Solœcism* to say *some*; as to say, that *some* of the *Apostles betrayed Christ*, when it is known, that *none* but *Judas* did it. But, if I should say, that *some Jesuits* had writ for the killing of *Kings*, and in the *Margent* should cite *Mariana*, no person conversant in their *writings*, would think it a *Solœcism*; for, though I produce him for a remarkable Instance, yet that doth not imply, that I have *none* else to produce, but only that the mentioning of *one*, might shew I

Et sic aperitur modus intelligendi illud Augustini, Evangelio non crederem, nisi me authoritas Ecclesiæ compulisset. Ibidem enim Ecclesiam sumit, pro primitivâ congregatione fidelium eorum, qui Christum viderunt, audierunt, & sui testes fuerunt. Gerson. lect. 2. *de vitâ spirituali an.* Coroll. 7.

Hic autem quod dictum est de approbatione Scripturæ per Ecclesiam, intelligitur solum de Ecclesiâ quæ fuit tempore Apostolorum, qui fuerunt repleti Spiritu Sancto, & nihilominus viderunt miracula Christi & audierunt ejus Doctrinam, & ob hoc fuerunt convenientes testes omnium quæ Christus fecit aut docuit, ut per eorum testimonium Scriptura, continens facta & dicta Christi, approbaretur. Durand. l. 3. dist. 24. q. 1. sect. 9.

was

was not without proof of what I ſaid. For your impudent oblique ſlander on the memory of that *excellent Prelate Arch-Biſhop Cranmer*, when you ſay, *If a Catholick to diſgrace the Proteſtant Primacy of* Canterbury, *ſhould ſay, Some of them carried a holy Siſter lockt up in a Cheſt about with them, and name* Cranmer *only in the Margent*; His memory is infinitely above your ſlyeſt detractions; and withal, when you are about ſuch a piece of *Criticiſm*, I pray, tell me, what doth *ſome of them* relate to? Is *Primacy* the name of *ſome men*? Juſt as if one ſhould diſgrace the *See* of *Rome*, and ſay, *Some of them have been Atheiſts, Magicians, debauched*, &c. Though, I confeſs, it were a great injury in this caſe, to cite but *one* in the *Margent*, unleſs in pity to the Reader; yet, you may ſooner vindicate *ſome of them* from a *Solœciſm* in *Language*, when the *See* of *Rome* went before, than *any of them* from thoſe *Solœciſms* in *manners*, which your own Authours have complained of.

But, ſay you, *What if this ſingular-plural ſay no ſuch thing, as the words alledged by the Biſhop ſignifie?* I have already granted it to have been a very venial miſtake of memory in his Lordſhip of *Occham* for *Durandus*, in whom thoſe very words are which are in the Margent of his Lordſhips Book, as appears in the Teſtimony already produced. I acknowledge therefore, that *Occham* in that place of his *Dialogues*, doth ſpeak of the *Catholick Church of all Ages*, comprehending the *Apoſtles and Evangeliſts* in it; and in this ſenſe he ſaith, that place of S. *Auguſtine* is to be underſtood. But, what advantage this is to your cauſe, I cannot imagine. For, what if the *Catholick Church* be taken in that comprehenſive ſenſe, to include not only the *Apoſtles*, but the *Church* ſucceſſively from their times? Doth it hence follow, *That it is not day though the Sun ſhines?* Or rather, Doth it not follow, That you are not ſo *quick-ſighted* as you would ſeem to be? And, Whether his Lordſhip or you come nearer the meaning of *Occham*'s words, let any one judge. For they who ſpeak of the *Church* in that comprehenſive ſence, do only ſuppoſe the *Infallibility* to have been in the *Primitive Apoſtolical Church*, but the *ſucceſſive Church* to be only the chanel of *conveyance* of that Teſtimony down to us, and ſo they ſay no more than we do. Thus *Driedo* expounds that place of S. *Auguſtine*; *who underſtands it of the Catholick Church, which was from the beginning of the Chriſtian Faith, increaſing according to the courſe of ſucceſſion of Biſhops to theſe times, which Church comprehends in it the Colledge of Apoſtles.* Do you think that theſe men did believe a *preſent Infallibility* in the *Church*? If ſo, To what end are they ſo careful to carry it ſo high as the *Apoſtles*? Whereas, on your Principle we can have no Aſſurance concerning any thing that the *Apoſtles did or ſaid* but only for the *Infallibility of the preſent Church*. You muſt therefore underſtand the *preſent Church* excluſively of the *Apoſtolical Church*; and therefore if S. *Auguſtine* be underſtood in their ſenſe, he is far enough from ſerving your purpoſes. But, ſay you, It is evident, that S. *Auguſtine muſt ſpeak of the Church in his time, becauſe he ſpeaks of that Church which ſaid to him*, Noli credere Manichæo, *which was not true of the Apoſtolical Church?* But, Why might not the *Apoſtolical Church* be a reaſon to S. *Auguſtine*, not to believe *Manichæus*, becauſe he found no footſteps of his Doctrine in the *Records* of that Church? Again, ſuppoſe he means the *preſent Church*, Doth he mean the *infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church*? Might not the Teſtimony of the *Church*, ſuppoſing it fallible, be ſufficient for what S. *Auguſtine* ſaith of it? I doubt it not: And, you ſeem to have no great confidence in this Teſtimony your ſelf, when you add, *That though it be a point of Faith to believe that the Church is infallible, in delivering Scripture to us, yet it is not a point of Faith, that her Infallibility is proved out of the cited place of S.* Auguſtine. *But,*

P. 79.

Auguſtinus cum dicit, ego Evangelio, &c. intelligit de Eccleſiâ Catholicâ quæ fuit ab initio Chriſtianæ fidei, ſecundum ſeriem ſucceſſionis Epiſcoporum creſcens ad hæc uſque tempora, quæ ſanè Eccleſia compleditur Collegium Apoſtolorum. Driedo. Tom. 1. l. 4. cap. 4.

when you ſay, *it is ſufficient that it be clear and manifeſt out of the Text it ſelf*, what Text do you mean? S. *Auguſtines*, or the *Scriptures*? If S. *Auguſtines*, you would do well to ſhew, by what engines you force *Infallibility* out of his words; if the *Scriptures*, What becomes of our *good Motives of Credibility*?

§. 20. P. 81. n. 21. P. 80. When his Lordſhip objects, *That according to your Principles, the Tradition of the preſent Church muſt be as infallible as that of the Primitive*, you very learnedly diſtinguiſh, *That if he means, the one muſt be as truly and really infallible*, quoad ſubſtantiam, *as the other, you grant it: But if he mean, the one muſt be as highly and perfectly infallible, as the other*, quoad modum, *you deny it*. Very good ſtill! It ſeems there are higher and lower degrees in Infallibility. I pray tell us, What that is which is *more than infallible*? The *preſent Church* (you ſay) *is infallible, but not ſo highly and perfectly infallible*, therefore there muſt be *degrees* in *Infallibility*; and ſince the loweſt *degree* is *infallible*, that which is *highly infallible*, muſt be *more* than *infallible*. Again, What difference is there between the *ſubſtance* and the *mode* in *Infallibility*? I had thought, the *ſubſtance of Infallibility* had lain in the *mode*; and I ſhould rather think *Infallibility it ſelf* to be a *mode* of *Apprehenſion*, than talk of *ſubſtances and modes* in it. But, it may be, you mean *ſuch kind of modes of Infallibility, as abſolute and hypothetical*. If you do ſo, explain your ſelf by them; and that we may better underſtand your meaning, ſhew us whether the *Church* be at all capable of *abſolute Infallibility*; if not, What difference there is in *degrees* between the *hypothetical Infallibility of the preſent and Primitive Church*, ſuppoſing both *infallible* in delivering their Teſtimony, and no otherwiſe. For you yet again add, *Of the Churches Teſtimony being infallible, but not ſimply Divine*, but it is the infallible Teſtimony of a deſperate cauſe, to have but one bad ſhift, and to uſe it ſo often.

P. 22. Becauſe you would be apt to ſay, That upon his *Lordſhips* rejecting the Infallibility of Tradition, he left no uſe at all of it; *He therefore tells you, Notwithſtanding that, it is ſerviceable for very good ends, that it induces Infidels to the reading and conſideration of Scripture, and that it inſtructs novices, and doubters in the Faith; which two ends* (you ſay) *fall ſhort of the end of Tradition; For* (ſay you) *it founds and eſtabliſhes Believers, even the greateſt Doctors of the Church*; for which you cite again this ſame place of S. *Auguſtine*. But did not his *Lordſhip* tell you, that ſome of your own underſtood that very place, *either of Novices or Infidels*? For which, beſides the Teſtimony of ſome of your own party, he adds this reaſon, *becauſe the words immediately before are, If thou find one* qui Evangelio nondum credit, *which did not yet believe the Goſpel, What wouldſt thou do to make him believe?* Ego vero non, &c. To which you very prudently ſay nothing.

Concerning *Jacobus Almayn*'s Opinion, *That we are firſt, and more, bound to believe the Church than the Scripture*; you would ſeem in terms to diſavow it, though very faintly; *it is not altogether true*; and hope to ſalve it by a diſtinction of *priority of time and nature*: and you acknowledge, *That in priority of nature we are firſt bound to believe the Church*; and, I ſuppoſe, in priority of *time* too, if we believe the *Scripture for the Churches ſake: Yet, you would not have it ſaid, That we are more bound to believe the Church than Scripture*; but it is not what you would have properly ſaid, but what follows from that antecedent, which *Jacobus Almayn* puts. *It is certain*, ſaith he, *that we are bound to believe all things contained in the Sacred Canon, upon that account alone, becauſe the Church believes them; therefore we are firſt, and more, bound to believe the Church than the Scripture*, which is ſo evident a conſequence, that nothing but ſhame would make you deny it.

Touching

Touching *Almayn*'s and *Gerſon*'s reading *compelleret* for *commoveret*, his Lordſhip ſaith, That *Almayn* falſifies the Text notoriouſly; you ſay, *No*; but *you had rather charitably think, they both read it ſo in ſome Copies*; his Lordſhip produceth *a very ancient M. S. for the common reading*, you none at all for that, but only the concurrent Teſtimonies of *ſome Schoolmen*, who muſt be confeſſed to be *excellent Criticks*, and well verſed in *ancient M. SS.* unleſs where they met with a *little Greek*, or ſome *hard Latin words*; and among whom, the miſtake of one would paſs current for want of examining *Copies*, let the Reader therefore judge, whether Judgement be more probable: But, I think it not worth while to ſay more about it.

In your vindication of the Authority of *Canus*, you make uſe of a very ſilly piece of *Sophiſtry*; for, ſay you, *Though he make Infidels and Novices in the Faith, to be convinced by the Authority of the Church*; *yet, you ſay, It doth not follow, that he makes the ſaid Authority a fallible, but a certain and ſure way to make them believe it.* But, 1. The Queſtion is, Whether *Canus* doth underſtand that place of S. *Auguſtine*, of Infidels and Novices or no? 2. Suppoſe he ſays, *It is a ſure way*, Doth it therefore follow, that it is *an infallible way?* Is nothing *certain* but what is *infallible?* I hope you are *certain* that the *Church of Rome* is the *Catholick Church*; but, Are you *infallible* that ſhe is ſo? If you advance all *certainty* to *Infallibility*, or bring down all *Infallibility* to *Certainty*, every *Chriſtian* is as *infallible* as your *Church* is: For, I make no queſtion, but that every *good Chriſtian* is *certain* of the *Grounds* and *Principles* of his *Religion*. The ſame thing you return upon again (after to little purpoſe you multiply words about *Canus* and *Stapleton*'s Teſtimonies.) For, ſay you, becauſe S. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks of a *ſure way*, therefore he muſt mean an *infallible way*, as though what was not *ſupernaturally infallible*, was preſently *unſure*. I pray, tell me, *Are you ſure that two and two make four?* Yet, I hope you will not ſay, You are *ſupernaturally infallible* that they do ſo. I hope, you are ſure, there is a *Pope* at *Rome*, and a goodly *Colledge* of *Cardinals* there; but, Are you infallible in this? It is not then certainly the ſame, to deny a thing to be *infallible*, and to make it *unſure*: And, you are either very *weak*, or very *wilful*, in ſaying ſo. In what ſenſe this ſo much controverted place of S. *Auguſtine*, is to be underſtood, will be afterwards diſcuſſed; and whether it be intended wholly for *Infidels* or no: only I ſhall take notice now, how, in the *laſt words* of this Chapter, you would again infer *Infallibility* from *undoubted certainty*. *For*, ſay you, *the Church, in S.* Auguſtine's *time, eſteemed her ſelf undoubtedly certain, that the Goſpel was the infallible Word of God; for otherwiſe ſhe might be deceived her ſelf, and deceive others in commanding them to believe that to be God's Word, which was only the word of man*: But, What is it you would infer from all this? For we believe the *Church* as undoubtedly *certain*, as may be, that the *Scriptures* are *God's Word*; yet we are far enough from believing that her Teſtimony now is *ſupernaturally infallible*.

CHAP. VII.

The Proteſtant Way of reſolving Faith.

Several Principles premiſed in order to it. The diſtinct Queſtions ſet down, and their ſeveral Reſolution given. The Truth of matters of fact, the Divinity of the Doctrine, and of the Books of Scripture, diſtinctly reſolved into their proper grounds. Moral Certainty a ſufficient Foundation for Faith, and yet Chriſtian Religion proved to be infallibly True. How Apoſtolical Tradition made by his Lordſhip a Foundation of Faith. Of the certainty we have of the Copies of Scripture, and the Authority of them. S. Auguſtin's *Teſtimony concerning Church-Authority, largely diſcuſſed and vindicated. Of the private Spirit, and the neceſſity of Grace. His Lordſhip's Way of reſolving Faith vindicated. How far Scripture may be ſaid to be known by its own Light. The ſeveral Teſtimonies of* Bellarmine, Brierly, *and* Hooker, *cleared.*

§. 1. HAving thus far followed you through all your intricacies and windings, and ſhewed, with what diligence and ſubtilty you would juggle men out of their *Faith*, under a pretence of *Infallibility*; it will be neceſſary for the vindicating our Doctrine, and the clearing this important Controverſie with all evidence and perſpicuity, to lay down thoſe certain grounds which we build our Faith upon. And, although it be one of the greateſt of your Modern Artifices to perſwade the world, that *Proteſtants* have no certain grounds of Faith at all, yet I doubt not but to make it evident, that the way taken by the moſt judicious and conſiderative *Proteſtants*, is as ſatisfactory and reaſonable, as I have already made it appear, that yours is unreaſonable and ridiculous. Which I ſhall the rather do, becauſe, through the want of a clear and diſtinct apprehenſion of the true way of reſolving Faith, no Controverſie in Religion hath been more obſcure and involved, than this hath been. Therefore for our more diſtinct method of proceeding, I ſhall firſt endeavour to prevent miſunderſtanding, by premiſing ſeveral things which are neceſſary for a through opening the ſtate of the Controverſie, and then come to the reſolution of it. The things then I would premiſe, are theſe following:

1. That we enquire not after the *reaſon, why we aſſent to what is divinely revealed*, but after the *reaſon why we believe any thing to be a Divine Revelation.* Therefore when men ſpeak of the *laſt reſolution of Faith* into the *Veracity* of *God* revealing, they ſpeak that which is undoubtedly true, but it reacheth not our preſent enquiry. I freely grant, that the *ultimate reaſon* why any thing is believed, is upon the *Teſtimony* of him from whom it comes; and the greater the knowledge and fidelity is, of him whoſe Teſtimony I believe, the *ſtronger* my *Aſſent* is, ſuppoſing I have ſufficient evidence that it is his Teſtimony. But that is not our preſent Queſtion; for it being taken for granted among all *Chriſtians*, that *God's Teſtimony* is *abſolutely infallible*, there can no diſpute ariſe concerning the ground of reſolving *Faith*, ſuppoſing *God's Revelation* to be ſufficiently known. For no one queſtions but *God's Veracity* however diſcovered, is a ſufficient ground for Faith; but all the Queſtion is, How we come to know wherein this *Veracity* of *God* doth diſcover it ſelf; or what thoſe things are which are immediately revealed by him. Therefore to tell us, that the *reſolution* of *Faith* is into *God's Infallible Teſtimony*, without ſhewing on what account this Teſtimony is to be believed to be from *God*, is, to tell us that which no one doubts of, and to eſcape that which is the main queſtion.

queſtion. For in caſe *Iſaac* ſhould have denyed ſubmiſſion to his *Fathers* will when he went to be ſacrificed, till he could be ſatisfied concerning the lawfulneſs of that action which his *Father* went about; Do you think it had been ſatisfactory to him, if *Abraham* had told him, that *God* had power to relax his own *Laws*, and therefore he need not queſtion the lawfulneſs of the action; might not *Iſaac* have preſently anſwered, That he did not queſtion, but what *God* commanded was lawful, but that he deſired, was, ſome evidence that he had a *revelation* for what he did. And the anſwer to this had been only pertinent and ſatisfactory. So that he might have no reaſon to queſtion it, although he did not believe any thing more than common fidelity in his *Fathers* teſtimony. For *God* never (when revelations were moſt common) thought it neceſſary to multiply *revelations* ſo far, as to make one neceſſary to atteſt another; but that *revelation* which was communicated to one was obligatory to all concerned in it, though they could have nothing but *Moral certainty* for it. By this it appears, that when we now ſpeak of the *reſolution* of *Faith*, though the *utmoſt reaſon* of our aſſent, is, that *Infallibility* which is ſuppoſed in *Divine Teſtimony*, yet the neareſt and moſt proper reſolution of it, is, into the grounds inducing us to believe that ſuch a Teſtimony is *truly Divine*; and the *reſolution* of this cannot be into any Divine Teſtimony without a proceſs in *infinitum*.

2. That when we ſpeak of the *reſolution of Faith*, by *Faith* we underſtand a *rational* and *diſcurſive act* of the mind. For *Faith* being an *aſſent* upon *evidence*, or *reaſon* inducing the mind to aſſent, it muſt be a *rational* and *diſcurſive act*; and ſuch a one that one may be able to give an account of to another. And this account which men are able to give why they do believe, or on what ground they do it, is that which we call *reſolving Faith*. And by this it appears, that whatever reſolves *Faith* into its *efficient cauſe*, (which ſome improperly call *the Teſtimony of the ſpirit*) though it may be true, yet comes not home to the queſtion. For if by the *Teſtimony of the ſpirit* be meant that *operation* of the *ſpirit* whereby ſaving *Faith* is wrought in us, then it gives no account from the *thing* to be believed, why we *aſſent* to it, but only ſhews how *Faith* is wrought in us by way of *efficiency*; which is rather reſolving the queſtion *about the neceſſity of Grace* than the *grounds of Faith*. Our queſtion is not then, concerning the neceſſity of *infuſed habits of Grace*, but of thoſe *rational inducements* which do incline the mind to a firm aſſent. For *Faith* in us, however it is wrought, being a *perſwaſion* of the mind, it is not conceivable how there ſhould be any *diſcurſive act* of the mind, without ſome *reaſon* cauſing the mind to aſſent to what is propounded to it. For without this, Faith would be an unaccountable thing, and *the ſpirit of revelation* would not be *the ſpirit of wiſdom*; and *Religion* would be expoſed to the contempt of all unbelievers, if we were able to give no other account of Faith, than that it is wrought in us by the *Spirit of God*. When we ſpeak therefore of the *reſolving Faith*, we mean, what are the *rational inducements to believe*, or what evidence there is in the object propounded to make us firmly aſſent to it.

3. *According to the different acts of Faith, there muſt be aſſigned a different reſolution of Faith.* For every act being *rational* and diſcurſive, muſt have its proper *grounds* belonging to it; unleſs we ſuppoſe that act elicited without any *reaſon* for it, which is incongruous with the nature of the humane underſtanding.

§. 2. There are then in the queſtion of *reſolution of Faith*, theſe three queſtions to be reſolved. Firſt, *Why I believe thoſe things to be true which are contained in the Book called the Scripture?* 2. *Why I believe the Doctrine contained in that Book to be Divine?* 3. *Why I believe the Books themſelves to be*

be of Divine Revelation? Now every one of theſe *queſtions* admits of a different *way* of *reſolution*; as will appear by the handling each of them diſtinctly.

1. If I be asked, *On what grounds I believe the things to be true which are contained in Scripture*, my anſwer muſt be, From the *greateſt evidence of truth*, which things of that nature are capable of. If therefore the *perſons* who are ſuppoſed to have writ theſe things, were *ſuch* who were fully acquainted with what they writ of; if they were ſuch *perſons* who cannot be ſuſpected of any deſign to *deceive* men by their *writings*; and if I be certain that theſe which go under the *name* of their *writings*, are undoubtedly theirs; I muſt have ſufficient *grounds* to believe the truth of them. Now that the *writers of theſe things cannot be ſuſpected of ignorance*, appears by the *time* and *age* they writ in, when the *ſtory* of theſe things was new, and ſuch multitudes were willing enough to have *contradicted* it, if any thing had been amiſs: beſides, *ſome* of the *writers* had been intimately converſant with the *perſon* and *actions* of him whom they writ moſt of. *That they could have no intent to deceive*, appears from the *ſimplicity* and *candour* both of their *actions* and *writings*, from their *contempt* of the world, and expoſing themſelves to the greateſt *hazards* to bear witneſs to them. *That theſe are the very ſame writings*, appears by all the *evidence* can be deſired; For we have as great, if not much greater *reaſon* to believe them to be the *Authours* of the *Books* under their *Names*, than any other *writers* of any *Books* whatſoever, both becauſe the *matters* are of greater *moment*, and therefore men might be ſuppoſed more *inquiſitive* about them; and that they have been unanimouſly received for theirs from the very *time* of their being firſt written, (except ſome very few, which upon ſtrict examination were admitted too) and we find theſe very *Books* cited by the learned *Chriſtians* under theſe Names in that time, when it had been no difficulty to have found out ſeveral of the Original *Copies* themſelves. When therefore they were univerſally received by *Chriſtians*, never doubted of by *Jews*, or *Heathen Philoſophers*: we have as great evidence for this *firſt act of Faith*, as it is capable of. And he is unreaſonable who deſires more.

2. *If I be asked, why I believe the Doctrine contained in theſe Books to be Divine?* I muſt give in two things for anſwer. 1. *That in the Age when the Doctrine was delivered, there was ſufficient reaſon to believe it Divine.* 2. *That if there was ſufficient reaſon then, we have ſufficient reaſon now.*

1. *That in the Age when the Doctrine was delivered, there was ſufficient reaſon to believe it Divine*; Suppoſing then, that we already believe upon the former anſwer, that all *the matters of fact* be true. I anſwer, that if *Chriſt* did ſuch unparallel'd *miracles*, and roſe from the dead, they who heard his *Doctrine* had reaſon to believe it to be of *God*: and this I ſuppoſe the greateſt *Infidel* would not deny, if himſelf had been one of the *witneſſes* of his *actions* and *reſurrection*.

2. *That if they had reaſon then, we have ſo now*; becauſe tradition to us doth only ſupply the want of our *ſenſes*, as to what *Chriſt* did and ſpake; *i. e.* That *tradition* is a kind of *derivative* and *perpetuated ſenſation* to us; it being of the ſame uſe to *us* now which our *eyes* and *ears* had been, if we had been actually preſent when *Chriſt* delivered his Doctrine and wrought his Miracles. Which that we may better underſtand, we may conſider what the uſe of our *ſenſes* had been, if we had been then preſent; and conſequently what the *uſe* of *tradition* is now to us. Now it is apparent, that the uſe of the *ſenſes*, to thoſe *who ſaw the Miracles and heard the Doctrine of Chriſt*, was not to give any *credibility* to either of them, but only to be the *means* of conveying to them thoſe things which might induce them to believe; the ſame doth *tradition* now to us, it doth not in it ſelf make the *Doctrine*

ctrine more *credible*, but ſupplies the uſe of our *ſenſes* in a certain conveyance of thoſe things to us which were the *motives* to believe then. For the *motives* to *Faith* both to them and us are the ſame, only the manner of conveyance is different; but our caſe is much the ſame with thoſe who lived in the ſame *Age*, but by reaſon of diſtance of *place* could not be perſonally preſent at what *Chriſt did* or *ſaid*; now if thoſe *perſons* were *obliged* to *believe*, and had ſufficient *reaſon* for *Faith*, who by reaſon of *diſtance of place* could not exerciſe their *ſenſes* about *Chriſts Doctrine* and *Miracles*, the ſame *reaſon* and *obligation* have we, who cannot do it by reaſon of *diſtance of time*. And if there be any advantage on either ſide, it is on ours, becauſe though the *tradition* doth not in it ſelf give any *credibility* to the *Doctrine*, yet there are ſuch *circumſtances* accompanying this tradition, which may much facilitate our belief above *theirs*: becauſe by ſuch a continued tradition we have an evidence of the *efficacy* of this *Doctrine*, which had ſo continual a *power* as to engage ſo many in all *ages* ſince its firſt appearance to be the propagators and defenders of it. And therefore this hath very much the advantage of the *report* of any *credible perſons* in that *age*, who might report to any at diſtance the *Miracles* and *Doctrine of Chriſt*. And this is the way of reſolution of Faith, which the Scripture it ſelf directs us to. *How ſhall we eſcape if we neglect ſo great ſalvation, which at the firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him: God alſo bearing them witneſs both with ſigns and wonders, and with diverſe miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, according to his own will?* Where we plainly ſee, the *reſolution of Faith* as to the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine* was into the *Miracles* wrought for the confirmation of it (which was the proper *witneſs* or *teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt*) but the means of conveyance was by the *tradition* of thoſe who were *eye* and *ear-witneſſes* of what *Chriſt* ſaid or did. As therefore it was not ſuppoſed neceſſary for them who ſaw the *miracles* of *Chriſt*, either to have ſome *inward Teſtimony* of the *Spirit*, or ſome external *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *Church*, to aſſure them that theſe *miracles* were really done by *Chriſt*, but *God* left them to the judgement of *ſenſe*; ſo proportionably neither of thoſe *two* is now neceſſary for the *reſolution of our Faith*, but *God* inſtead of the judgement of *ſenſe* leaves us to the evidence of *Tradition*. Heb. 2. 3, 4.

§. 3. Object. *But all this is* (you ſay) *no more than Moral certainty, which being fallible, we cannot from thence be aſſured that Chriſtian Religion is Infallibly true? Anſw.* This being the great *bug-bear* wherewith you would fright men out of their *Religion*, I ſhall in this place ſhew, that it ſerves only to ſcare fools and children with. For, 1. What greater *certainty* had they who lived in the time of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, and did not ſee their *Miracles*? Had they, or could they have, any more than this you call *moral Certainty*? and, Do you really think, that all ſuch could not be ſufficiently aſſured, that *Chriſtian Religion* was infallibly true? 2. *Moral Certainty* may be a ſufficient Foundation for the moſt *firm Aſſent*; and therefore, if the matter to be believed be the *infallible Truth* of a *Doctrine* upon *ſuitable evidence*, though we have now but *moral Certainty* of that evidence, the *Aſſent* may be firm to ſuch a *Doctrine* as infallible. And therefore the grand miſtake lyes here, as though our *Faith* were reſolved finally into this *moral Certainty*; or, as if the Faith of thoſe who ſaw *Chriſt's Miracles*, were reſolved into their *eyes*, and not into the *Miracles*; for as their *eyes* were but the *means* of conveyance of that *evidence* which was *infallible*, ſo is that *Tradition* to us by which we have our *Certainty* of thoſe evidences of the *infallible Truth* of *Chriſtian Religion*. And we are further to conſider that the nature of *Certainty* is not ſo much to be taken from the *matters themſelves*, as from the *grounds* inducing the *Aſſent*; that is, Whether

ther the *things* be *Mathematical*, *Phyſical*, or *Moral*; if there be no *reaſon* to *queſtion* the *grounds* of belief, the caſe is all one as to the nature of the *Aſſent*. So that *moral Certainty* may be as *great* as *Mathematical* and *Phyſical*, ſuppoſing as little reaſon to *doubt* in *moral things* as to their *natures*, as in *Mathematical* and *Phyſical* as to theirs. Therefore this great quarrel about *moral Certainty* is very unreaſonable; unleſs it be proved, that there is no cauſe of *firm Aſſent* upon *moral grounds*; now, if the *cauſe* of the *Aſſent* may be, as *equal* and *proportionable* to their *nature* in *moral things*, as in *Mathematical*; there may be as *firm* an *Aſſent* in the *One*, as in the *Other*, as I have already ſhewed. For which, this *reaſon* is plain and evident, that *Certainty* implies the taking away all *ſuſpicion of doubt*: But there can be no taking away all *ſuſpicion of doubt* in *Mathematical* things, without *Mathematical evidence*; but in *moral things*, all ſuſpicion of *doubt* is removed upon *moral evidence*, and therefore the *Certainty* may be as great in the Aſſent to one as the other. Thus, we ſee, how unjuſtly, and how much to the diſhonour of Religion you quarrel with *moral evidence*, as an uncertain thing. But, I anſwer yet further, 3. *That the greateſt aſſurance we can deſire, that any Religion is infallibly True, is from moral Certainty*; and that upon theſe three grounds. 1. *Becauſe the grounds of all Religion are capable of no more.* 2. *Becauſe the higheſt evidence of any Religion muſt depend upon it.* 3. *Becauſe this, in it ſelf, may evidently demonſtrate, that Chriſtian Religion is infallibly True.*

1. *There can be no greater than this moral Certainty of the main Foundations of all Religion*, which are, The *Being of God*, and *Immortality of ſouls*; without the ſuppoſition of which, there can be no ſuch thing as Infallibility in the world; and therefore from thence I may eaſily prove, that there can be no more than moral *Certainty* of the exiſtence of a *Deity*. For, if the very notion of Infallibility doth ſuppoſe a *God*, then you cannot infallibly prove that there is *One* (in your ſenſe of Infallibility) for then you muſt beg the Queſtion, and ſuppoſe that already to be, which you are proving the *exiſtence* of: Now that, *Infallibility* in us doth ſuppoſe the *exiſtence of God*, appears moſt evidently, becauſe, mans underſtanding being of it ſelf fallible, it cannot be ſuppoſed in any thing infallible, without the *ſupernatural Aſſiſtance* of a *being Infallible*, which can be nothing elſe but *God*. But, if you think you have *infallible proofs*, produce them, and convince the world of *Atheiſts* by them: We acknowledge we have as great *evidence* and *certainty*, as humane nature is capable of, of a *Being* of ſuch a *Nature* as *God* is, from the conſideration of his works; but all this ſtill is *moral Certainty*; for the grounds are neither *Mathematically demonſtrative*, nor *ſupernaturally infallible*. What folly and madneſs then is it for your party to cry out ſo much againſt *moral Certainty in Religion*, when the *Foundation* of all *Religion* is capable of no more; And may not this juſtly increaſe our ſuſpicion, that under *moral Certainty* you ſtrike at the Foundation of all Religion?

2. *Suppoſe God give the moſt infallible evidence of any Religion, it is not poſſible, but that ſome who are bound to believe that Religion, can have any more than moral Certainty of it.* And, for all that, I know the greateſt *Phyſical Certainty* is as liable to queſtion as *moral*; there being as great a *poſſibility of Deception* in that, as a *ſuſpicion of doubt* in this, and oft-times greater. What advantage then had thoſe who ſtood by, and ſaw the *miracles* of *Moſes and Chriſt*, above thoſe who did not, but had the report of them conveyed to them in an unqueſtionable manner? Beſides, it is apparent, *God's* great aim in any *Religion*, is moſt at the good of thoſe who can have only a *moral Certainty* of the great *evidences* of the *Truth* of that *Religion*; becauſe it being *God's* intention, that the *Religion* delivered by Him,

Him, ſhould be not meerly for the benefit of thoſe very few perſons who could be preſent at ſuch things, but for the advantage of thoſe incomparably greater numbers, who, by reaſon of *diſtance* of *place and age*, could not be preſent; it would argue a ſtrange want of *proviſion* for mens *Faith*, unleſs *moral Certainty* were ſufficient. Only you indeed will ſuppoſe that which *God* himſelf never thought neceſſary, *viz. an infallible Teſtimony of the preſent Church*; but to what good purpoſes you have introduced this, hath largely appeared already.

3. *Moral Certainty yields us ſufficient Aſſurance, that Chriſtian Religion is infallibly true:* And that I prove, becauſe *moral Certainty* may evidently ſhew us the *Credibility* of the *Chriſtian Religion*, which you deny not, nor any elſe; and, that from the *Credibility* of it, the *infallible Truth* of it may be proved, will appear by theſe two things:

1. *That where there is evident Credibility in the matter propounded, there doth ariſe upon men an obligation to believe:* And that is proved both by your own confeſſion (as to the *Churches Infallibility* being believed on the *Motives of Credibility*) and from *Gods intention*, in giving ſuch *Motives*, which was, to perſwade them to believe, as appears by multitudes of *places* of *Scripture*; and withal, though the meer *Credibility* of the *Motives* might at firſt ſuppoſe ſome *doubts* concerning the *Infallibility* of the *Doctrine*, yet it is not conſiſtent with any doubt, as to the *Infallibility* of the *obligation to believe*; becauſe there can be no other reaſon aſſigned of theſe *Motives of Credibility*, than the inducing on men an *obligation* to *Faith*.

2. *That where there is ſuch an obligation to believe, we have the greateſt aſſurance, that the matter to be believed is infallibly True:* Which depends upon this manifeſt proof, *That God cannot oblige men to believe a lye*; it being repugnant to all our conceptions of the *Veracity* and *Goodneſs of God*, to imagine, that *God* ſhould require from men (on the pain of *eternal damnation*, for not believing) to believe ſomething as *infallibly True*, which is really falſe. Thus, you ſee, what a clear and pregnant demonſtration we have of the *infallible Truth of Chriſtian Religion* from *moral Certainty*; How injurious then have thoſe of your party been, who have charged this opinion of believing upon *moral Certainty*, with betraying *Religion*, and denying *Chriſtian Religion* to be *infallibly True*? Thus much for this grand Objection; I now come to the laſt Queſtion conſiderable in the Reſolution.

§. 4. 3. *On what account do I believe theſe particular Books of Scripture to be Gods Word?* Which may admit of a double ſenſe: 1. *On what account I do believe the Doctrine contained in theſe Books to be Gods Word?* 2. *On what account I do believe the Books containing this Doctrine to be Gods Word?* As to the *firſt*, I have anſwered already, *viz.* Upon the ſame *rational evidence* which *God* gave, that the *Teſtimony* of thoſe who delivered, was a *Divine* and *infallible Teſtimony*: To the ſecond, I anſwer in theſe two Propoſitions:

1. That the *laſt Reſolution of Faith* is not into the *Infallibility of the Inſtrument of conveyance*, but into the *Infallibility of that Doctrine*, which is thereby conveyed to us. For the writing of this *Doctrine* is only the *condition* by which this *Revelation* is made manifeſt to us; it being evident from the *nature* of the thing, that the *writing* of a *Divine Revelation* is not neceſſary for the *ground* and *reaſon of Faith*, as to that Revelation: becauſe men may believe a *Divine Revelation* without it; as is not only evident in the caſe of the *Patriarchs*, but of all thoſe, who in the time of *Chriſt*, and the *Apoſtles*, did believe the truth of the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt* before it was written. If therefore the *writing* be only the *condition* of the *manifeſtation* of the *Object* in a *certain* way to us, the *ground* and *reaſon* of *Faith*, is not to be reſolved into *that* which is only the *mode* of our knowledge of the Object to be believ'd; but into *that* which is properly the *ground* and *reaſon* why we believe that

Doctrine or *Revelation* to be *Divine*, which is contained in thoſe Books. And this is ſtill the caſe of all illiterate *perſons*, who cannot reſolve their *Faith* properly into the *Scripture*, but into the *Doctrine* delivered them out of *Scripture*. Hence we may diſcern the difference between the *Formal Object*, and the *Rule of Faith*; the *Formal Object* is that evidence which is given of the *Infallibility* of the *Teſtimony* of thoſe who delivered the Doctrine; the *infallible Rule of Faith* to us, is the *Scripture*, *viz.* that which limits and bounds the *material Objects* of Faith, which we are bound to believe; and this doth therefore diſcover to us what thoſe things are, which on the account of the *Formal Object*, we are obliged to believe.

2. *Thoſe who believe the Doctrine of Scripture to be Divine, have no reaſon to queſtion the infallible conveyance of that Doctrine to us, in thoſe Books we call the Scripture.* Therefore, whatever things we are to believe in order to ſalvation, we have as great evidence as we can deſire, that they are *infallibly* conveyed to us.

1. *If the Doctrine of Chriſt be True and Divine, then all the Promiſes he made were accompliſhed*: Now, that was one of the greateſt, *That his Spirit ſhould lead his Apoſtles into all Truth*; Can we then reaſonably think, that if the *Apoſtles* had ſuch an *infallible Aſſiſtance* of the *Spirit* of *God* with them, in what they ſpake in a tranſitory way to them who heard them, that they ſhould want it in the delivering thoſe *Records* to the *Church*, which were to be the ſtanding *monuments* of this Doctrine to all *Ages* and *Generations*. If *Chriſt's Doctrine* therefore be True, the *Apoſtles* had an infallible *Aſſiſtance* of *God's Spirit*; if they had ſo in delivering the *Doctrine of Chriſt* by preaching, nothing can be more unreaſonable, than to imagine ſuch ſhould want it, who were employed to give an account to the world of the *nature* of this *Doctrine*, and of the *Miracles* which accompanied *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*. So that it will appear an abſurd thing to aſſert, that the *Doctrine of Chriſt* is *Divine*, and to queſtion, whether we have the *infallible Records* of it. It is not pertinent to our Queſtion, in what way the *Spirit of God* aſſiſted them that wrote, Whether by immediate *ſuggeſtion* of all ſuch things which might be ſufficiently known without it; and whether in ſome things which were not of concernment, it might not leave them to their own judgement; (as in that place, *when they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs*, when, no doubt, *God's Spirit* knew infallibly whether it was, but thought not fit to reveal it) whether in ſome lighter circumſtances the Writers were ſubject to any inadvertencies (the negative of which is more piouſly credible) whether meer *hiſtorical paſſages* needed the ſame infallible Aſſiſtance, that *Prophetical* and *Doctrinal*; theſe things, I ſay, are not neceſſary to be reſolved, it being ſufficient in order to *Faith*, that the *Doctrine* we are to believe, as it was infallibly delivered to the world, by the preaching of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, ſo it is infallibly conveyed to us in the *Books of Scripture*.

Joh. 16. 13.

Joh. 6. 19.

2. *Becauſe theſe Books were owned for Divine by thoſe Perſons and Ages, who were moſt competent Judges, Whether they were ſo or no.* For the Age of the *Apoſtles* was ſufficiently able to judge, whether thoſe *things* which are ſaid to be ſpoken by *Chriſt*, or written by the *Apoſtles*, were really ſo or no. And we can have no reaſon at all to queſtion, but what was delivered by them, was infallibly true. Now, from that *firſt Age* we derive our *knowledge* concerning the *Authority* of theſe *Books*, which being conveyed to us in the moſt *unqueſtionable* and *univerſal Tradition*, we can have no reaſon in the world to doubt, and therefore the *greateſt reaſon* firmly to *aſſent*, that the *Books* we call the *Scripture*, are the *infallible Records* of the *Word of God*. And thus much may ſuffice in general concerning the Proteſtant Way of reſolving Faith: I now return to the examination of what you give us by way of anſwer to his Lordſhips diſcourſe.

The

The firſt Aſſault you make upon his Lordſhip, is, for making *Apoſtolical Tradition a ground of Faith*: but becauſe your peculiar excellency lyes in the involving plain things; the beſt ſervice I can do, is to lay things open as they are; by which means we ſhall eaſily diſcern where the truth lyes. I ſhall therefore firſt ſhew, how far his Lordſhip makes *Apoſtolical Tradition a ground of Faith*, and then conſider what you have to object againſt it. In that Section which your Margent refers to, all that he ſays of it, is, *That the Voice and Tradition of that Church which included in it Apoſtles, Diſciples, and ſuch as had immediate Revelation from Heaven, was Divine, and the Word of God from them is of like validity written or delivered. And, as to this Tradition* (ſaith he) *there is abundance of Certainty in it ſelf, but how far it is evident to us, ſhall after appear.* At the end of the next *n.* 21. he ſaith, *That there is double Authority, and both Divine, that confirms Scripture to be the Word of God. Tradition of the Apoſtles delivering it, and the internal worth and argument in the Scripture, obvious to a ſoul prepared by the preſent Churches Tradition, and Gods Grace.* But, *n.* 23. he ſaith, *That this Apoſtolical Tradition is not the ſole and only means to prove Scripture Divine, but the moral perſwaſion, reaſon, and force of the preſent Church, is ground enough for any one to read the Scripture, and eſteem reverently of it. And this once done, the Scripture hath then In and home-arguments enough to put a ſoul that hath but ordinary Grace, out of doubt, that the Scripture is the Word of God, infallible and Divine.* I ſuppoſe his Lordſhips meaning may be comprized in theſe particulars. 1. That to thoſe who lived in the *Apoſtolical* times the *Tradition of Scripture*, by thoſe who had an infallible Teſtimony, was a ſufficient ground of their believing it infallibly true. 2. That though the *conveyance* of that *Tradition* to us be not infallible, yet it may be ſufficient to raiſe in us a high eſteem and veneration for the *Scripture*. 3. That thoſe who have this *eſteem* for the *Scripture*, by a through ſtudying and conſideration of it, may undoubtedly believe that *Scripture* is the *Divine* and *Infallible* Word of *God*. This I take to be the ſubſtance of his Lordſhips diſcourſe. We now come to examine what you object againſt him. *Your firſt demand is, How comes Apoſtolical Primitive Tradition to work upon us, if the preſent Church be fallible?* Which I ſhall anſwer by another, How come the *decrees of Councils* to work upon you, if the reporters of thoſe *Decrees* be fallible? If you ſay, *It is ſufficient that the Decree it ſelf be infallible, but it is not neceſſary that the reporter of thoſe Decrees ſhould be ſo*; The ſame I ſay concerning the *Apoſtolical Tradition* of *Scripture*, though it were *infallible* in their *Teſtimony*, yet it is not neceſſary that the conveyance of it to us ſhould be *infallible*. And if you think your ſelf bound to believe the Decrees of *General Councils* as *infallible*, though fallibly conveyed to you; Why may not we ſay the ſame concerning *Apoſtolical Tradition?* Whereby you may ſee, though Tradition be *fallible*, yet the matter conveyed by it, may have its proper effect upon us. Your next Inquiry (if I underſtand it) is to this ſenſe, *Whether Apoſtolical Tradition be not then as credible as the Scriptures?* I anſwer freely (ſuppoſing it equally evident) what was delivered by the *Apoſtles* to the Church by word or writing, hath equal *Credibility*: You attempt to prove, *That there is equal evidence, becauſe the Scripture is only known by the Tradition of the Church, to be the ſame that was recommended by the Apoſtolical Church, which you have likewiſe for Apoſtolical Tradition.* But, 1. Do you mean the ſame *Apoſtolical Tradition* here or no, which the *Arch-Biſhop ſpeaks of, i. e.* that act of the *Apoſtles*, whereby they delivered the *Doctrine of Chriſt* upon their *Teſtimony* to the world? If you mean this Tradition, for my part, I do not underſtand it as any thing really diſtinct from the *Tradition* of the *Scripture* it ſelf. For, although I grant, that the *Apoſtles* did deliver that Doctrine by *Word* as well as *Writing*, yet if that *Tradition*

Sect. 16. n. 20.

P. 84.

P. 85.

P. 82.

by *Word* had been judged ſufficient, I much queſtion whether we had ever had any written *Records* at all. But, becauſe of the ſpeedy decay of an oral *Tradition*, if there had been no ſtanding *Records*, it pleaſed *God* in his infinite *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs*, to ſtir up ſome fit perſons to digeſt thoſe things ſummarily into writing, which otherwiſe would have been expoſed to ſeveral corruptions in a ſhort time. For we ſee preſently in the *Church*, notwithſtanding this, how ſuddenly the *Gnoſticks*, *Valentinians*, *Manichees* and others, did pretend ſome *ſecret Tradition* of *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* diſtinct from their writings. When therefore you can produce as certain evidence for any *Apoſtolical Tradition* diſtinct from *Scripture*, as we can do, that the *Books* of *Scripture* were delivered by the *Apoſtles* to the *Church*, you may then be hearkened to, but not before. 2. We have other ways to judge of the *Identity* of the *Copies* of Scripture (which we have) with thoſe delivered by the Primitive *Church*, beſides the *Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church*. And the judgement of the *preſent Church* conſidered meerly as ſuch can be no argument to ſecure any man concerning the integrity and incorruption of the *Books* of *Scripture*. We do therefore juſtly appeal to the ancient *Copies*, and *MSS.* which confirm the incorruption of ours. But,

P. 83. ſay you, *What infallible Certainty have we of them, beſides Church Tradition?* Very wiſely ſaid in ſeveral reſpects, as though no *Certainty* leſs than *infallible*, could ſerve mens turn as to ancient *Copies* of *Scripture*, and as though your *Church* could give men *Infallible certainty* which *Copies* were ancient and which were not. But for our parts, we ſhould not be at all nearer any *certainty* much leſs *Infallibility* concerning the *authenticalneſs of any ancient Copies*, becauſe your *Church* declared it ſelf for them; neither can we imagine it at all neceſſary in the examination of *ancient Copies* to have any *Infallible certainty* at all of them. For as well you may pretend it as to any other Authors, when all that we look after in ſuch *Copies* is only that evidence which things of that nature are capable of. But you make his *Lordſhip* give as wiſe an anſwer to this queſtion of yours; *They may be examined and approved by the authentical Autographa's of the very Apoſtles*. Where is it that this anſwer is given by his *Lordſhip?* If you may be allowed to make queſtions and anſwers too, no doubt, the one will be as wiſe as the other. But I ſuppoſe you thought, nothing could be ſaid pertinent in this caſe, but what you make his Lordſhip ſay: and then by the unreaſonableneſs of that anſwer, becauſe none of theſe *Autographa's* are ſuppoſed extant, and becauſe if they were ſo, all men could not be *Infallibly certain* of them, you think you have ſufficient advantage againſt your adverſary, becauſe thereby it would appear there can be no certainty of *Scripture* but from the *authority* of your *Church*. To which becauſe it may ſeem to carry on your great deſign of rendring *Religion* uncertain, I ſhall return a particular anſwer.

§. 6. 1. Suppoſing we could have no *certainty* concerning the *Copies* of *Scripture* but from *Tradition*, this doth not at all advantage your *cauſe*, unleſs you could prove, that no other *Tradition* but that of your *Church* can give us any certainty of it. Give me leave then to make this ſuppoſition, That *God* might not have given this *ſupernatural aſſiſtance to your Church*, which you pretend makes it *Infallible*, Whether men through the *Univerſal conſent* of perſons of the *Chriſtian Church* in all *Ages*, might not have been undoubtedly certain, That the *Scripture* we have, was the ſame delivered by the *Apoſtles? i. e.* Whether a *matter of fact*, in which the whole *Chriſtian world* was ſo deeply engaged, that not only their credit, but their intereſt was highly concerned in it, could not be atteſted by them in a credible manner? Which is as much as to ask, Whether the whole *Chriſtian* world was not at once beſotted and infatuated in the groſſeſt manner, ſo as to ſuffer the

records

records of those things which concerned their eternal welfare, to be imbezeled, falsified, or corrupted, so as to mistake them for *Apostolical writings*, which were nothing so. If it be not then credible, that the *Christian world* should be so monstrously imposed upon, and so grosly deceived, then certainly the *Universal Tradition of this Society* may yield unquestionable evidence to any inquisitive person, as to the *integrity* and *incorruption* of the *body* of *Scriptures*. And if it may yield such *evidence*, why doth it not so? when we see this was the very case of the Christian world in all *Ages*. Some *writings* were delivered to the *Church* of the Age they lived in, by the *Apostles*; these *writings* were so delivered, as that the *Christians* understood they were of things of more *concernment* to them than the *whole World* was; *these writings* were then received, embraced, and publickly read; *these writings* were preserved by them so sacred and inviolable, that it was accounted a crime of the highest nature to deliver the *Copies* of them into the hands of the *Heathen persecutors*; *these writings* were still owned by them as *Divine*, and the *rule* and *standard of Faith*, *these* were appealed to in all disputes among them, *these* were *preserved* from the *attempts* of *Hereticks*, *vindicated* from the *assaults* of the most *learned Infidels*, *transcribed* into the *Books* of the most diligent *Christians*, *transmitted* from one *Generation* to another, as the most sacred *depositum* of *Heaven*; And yet is it possible, to suppose that these *writings* should be extorted out of their *hands* by *violence*, *abused* under their *eyes* by *fraud*, or *suffered* to be *lost* by *negligence*. Yet no other way can be imagined, why any should suspect the *Books* of *Scripture* which we have are not the same with those delivered by the *Apostles*. All which are such unreasonable *suppositions*, that they could hardly enter into any *head* but *yours*, or *such* whose cause you manage in these disputes; the most profligate *Atheists*, or most unreasonable *Scepticks*. If then we entertain but mean and ordinary thoughts of the *Christians* of all Ages, if we look upon them as silly men abused into a *Religion* by *fraud* and *imposture*; yet we cannot doubt, but that these *persons* were careful to preserve the *records* of that *Religion*, because they were so diligent in the study of it, so venturous for it, such enemies to the corrupters of it, so industrious in propagating the knowledge of it to their *friends* and *Posterity*. Do you think our Nation did ever want an *Infallible Testimony* to preserve the *Magna Charta*, supposing no authentick *record* of it kept in the *Publick Archives* of the *Nation*? Would not mens interest make them careful to preserve it inviolable, especially considering the frequency of *causes* whose decision depends upon it, and the dispersion of the *Copies* abroad, and the diligence of such whose profession leads them to look to such things. And will not the same reasons hold in a greater measure for the *integrity* and *incorruption* of *Scriptures*? Do not the eternal Concerns of all *Christians* depend upon those *sacred records*, that, if those be not true, *they were of all men most miserable*? Were not innumerable *Copies* of these *writings* suddenly dispersed abroad, and all *Christians* accounted it a part of their *Religion* to search and enquire into them? Hath there not always been a succession of diligent and faithful persons, whose office and profession it hath been to read, interpret, and vindicate these *Books*? and who have left excellent *monuments* of their *endeavours* in this nature? Is it then possible to *suppose* all those *Copies* at once *imbezeled*, all those *Christians* in one age *deceived*, all those *Divines* so *secure* and *negligent* that there should be any considerable *alteration*, much less any total *depravation* of these writings? When once I see a whole *Corporation* consent to burn their publick *Charter*, and substitute a *new one* in the place of it, and this not be suspected or discovered; When I shall see a *Magna Charta* foisted, and neither *King* nor *people* be sensible of such a *Cheat*; When all the world shall conspire to

deceive

deceive themſelves and their *children*: I may then ſuſpect ſuch an *impoſture* as to the *Scripture*; but not before. And will not all this perſwade you, that there is no neceſſity of [illegible]ing your *Church Infallible* in order to our *certainty*, that we have the *ſame Books of Scripture* which were delivered by the *Apoſtles?* If not, the next news I ſhall expect to hear from you, will be, That we can have no *certainty* of the *Being of God*, or the *Foundation* of all *Religion*, but from your *Churches Infallibility*; there being every jot as much reaſon to ſay, that all mankind ſhould be deceived into the belief of a *Deity* by ſome cunning *Politicians*, as that all *Chriſtians* ſhould be deceived as to the *belief* of ſuch *Books* to be *Scripture* which were univerſally corrupted; and if you underſtood *Conſequences* you would have urged one aſſoon as the other. But ſtill remember, into what *precipices* this good doctrine of *Infallibility* leads you.

§. 7. But it may be your meaning is more gentle and eaſie, than to ſuppoſe there could be no *certainty* as to all the *Books* being the *ſame*, but only that we cannot have any *Infallible certainty* that there are no *corruptions* crept into theſe *Books* which we have, but from your *Churches Teſtimony*. To which I anſwer, 1. That there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe this ſhould be your meaning. 2. Suppoſing it were your meaning, there is no reaſon in the thing.

1. *There is no reaſon to ſuppoſe this ſhould be your meaning*; for you are ſpeaking of ſuch things which are neceſſary to be *believed*, and therefore are properly *objects of Faith*, but that there are no kind of *corruptions* crept into the *Copies* of *Scripture*, cannot with you be an *object of Faith*. For thoſe of your party do *ſome* of them *confeſs* and *others contend*, that there are many *corruptions* crept into the *Hebrew Text* of the Old *Teſtament*, and the *Greek* of the *New*; and that there are abundance of corruptions in your *Vulgar Latin* is not only abundantly proved by our Writers, but acknowledged by the *learneſt* of your own, and irrefragably demonſtrated by the different editions of *Sixtus* and *Clement*.

Suppoſe this were your meaning, *there were no reaſon in the thing*; For, 1. *Your Church cannot Infallibly aſſure us, there are no corruptions.* 2. *We may be ſufficiently aſſured of it without the Teſtimony of your Church.*

1. Your *Church* cannot aſſure us at all, much leſs *Infallibly* that there are no ſuch *corruptions*. For what reaſon can there be, Why we ſhould rely on the judgement of only a *part* of the whole *Society* of *Chriſtians*, and that *part* at great *oppoſition* with many other conſiderable *Churches*; muſt we then believe your *Church* where it agrees with, or it differs from the reſt? If *only where it agrees with the reſt*, then it is not the *teſtimony* of your *Church* we rely on, but the *Univerſal conſent* of all: If *where it differs*, ſhew us ſome reaſon, why we ſhould believe your *Church* in oppoſition to all others. Eſpecially, 1. When we conſider what contradiction there hath been in the teſtimony of your *Church* about this very thing: as appears not only by the great difference among your writers concerning the *authentick Copies*, ſome ſtill defending the *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, and others ſtanding up for that great *Diana of Rome* the *Vulgar Latin*. Conſidering then, that by the decree of the *Council of Trent* the *Vulgar Latin* is looked on by you as the moſt *authentick Copy* of the *Scripture*, let any one judge whether ever this could be judged more authentick, than when the *Pope* himſelf *in Cathedrâ* doth reviſe any *edition* of it, and uſe all poſſible care for the ſetting it forth, not only comparing it with the beſt ancient *MSS.* but taking the pains to correct it with his own hand both before and after the *Preſs*, and all this was done by *Sixtus* 5. as himſelf declares in the *Preface* to his *edition* of the *Vulgar Latin*, *A. D.* 1590. Yet within little more than two years after comes out the edition of *Clement* 8. which as appears by the computation of ſuch who have

have taken the pains to compare them, differs from the other in ſome *thouſands* of *places*. Now I pray tell me what *Infallible certainty* are we like to have concerning the *Copies of Scripture*, being the ſame with thoſe delivered by the *Apoſtles*, from the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, when this teſtimony of your *Church* doth ſo finely contradict it ſelf within little more than two years time? Nay when *Sixtus* 5. his care was ſo great and extraordinary in his *edition*, that an *Inſcription* was made in the *Vatican*, *in perpetuam rei memoriam*, which is in letters of *Gold* in theſe words,

SACRAM PAGINAM EX CONCILII TRIDENTINI PRÆSCRIPTO QUAM EMENDATISSIMAM DIVULGARI MANDAVIT.

Which *Inſcription*, as *Angelus Roccha* tells us, was purpoſely made to ſet forth that infinite care and pains which the *Pope* took in that edition, *Which were ſo great* (ſaith he) *that it is impoſſible that any ſhould recount them, and for his own part he ſtood aſtoniſhed when he ſaw them*: for he not only carefully corrected the Copy before the Impreſſion, but reviewed it ſheet by ſheet after, that the *edition* might be the more faithful. And ſhall we after all this believe that *Sixtus* 5. *never lived to ſee this edition compleat*, which is the miſerable ſhift ſome of your party have to avoid this evident *contradiction*: Or ſhall we think, what others pretend, *That he never lived to authorize this Edition of his*, whereas his *Brieve* doth in terms declare this to be the *authentick vulgar Latin*, which the Decree of the *Council of Trent* had reſpect to; but this *Brieve*, others ſay, *though provided was never proclaimed*; It ſeems then the *Popes Infallibility* depends upon *Proclamation*; but was not this *Bull* ſufficiently proclaimed which is extant in thoſe editions of *Sixtus* 5.? with an injunction that this Bible be read in all Churches *ne minimâ quidem particulâ, mutatâ, additâ, vel detractâ*, without any the *leaſt alteration*. Now then when the *Vulgar Latin* is owned by the *Council of Trent* for the *authentick Copy* of *Scripture*; when the *Pope* whoſe teſtimony muſt be ſuppoſed *Infallible* takes great pains in proſecution of the *decree* of that *Council* to declare and ſet forth the true authentick *edition* of this *Vulgar Latin*, When ſhould we ever, if not now, expect ſome *Infallible certainty* of the *true Copy* of the *Scripture*? yet ſo far are we from it, that not long after men are forbidden the *uſe* of that edition under the penalty of the greater Excommunication. *And all this*, forſooth, *under the pretence of Typographical faults*, and what then muſt we think of that *Pope* who took ſuch inceſſant pains to correct them? Thus we ſee how far we are from any certainty at all, much more from any Infallible certainty concerning the true *Copies* of *Scripture* from the *authority* of your *Church*. 2. The *authenticalneſs* of thoſe *Copies* ſet forth by the appointment of the *Council* of *Trent* and the approbation of the *Pope*, hath no greater evidence of *certainty* than any other *Copies* of *Scripture*, if they have ſo much. For all that *Sixtus* 5. pretends for the *authenticalneſs* of that *Copy*, is, the agreement of it with the *ancient* and *approved Copies* both Printed and *MSS.* which he had cauſed to be diligently ſearched in Libraries, *Than which*, (ſaith he) *there can be no more firm or certain argument of the true and genuine text*. Well ſaid however in this! But if the *Latin Copies* be ſo ſure a rule to judge of the *authenticalneſs* of the *Text* by, ſhall not much more the *ancient Copies* of the *Original Hebrew* and *Greek*; eſpecially when we conſider, that the vaſt difference of the *Clementine* and *Sixtine Bibles* lay in this, that *Clement* the 8. did correct the

Biblioth. Vatican. p. 229.

In hâc autem germani textûs per veſtigatione, ſatis perſpicuè inter omnes conſtat, nullum argumentum eſſe certius ac firmius, quam antiquorum probatorumque Codicum Latinarum fidem, quos tam impreſſos, quam MSS. ex bibliothecis variis conquirendos curavimus. Sixtus 5. Præfat.

the *Vulgar Latin* according to the original in above two thouſand places, when the contrary reading was eſtabliſhed by *Sixtus*. For the *Pope* where he pleaſed took the *Marginal Annotations* in the *Lovain Bibles* and inſerted them into the *text*; which *Marginal Annotations* contain the different *readings* which were obſerved from the comparing the *Vulgar Latin* with the *Originals*, as appears by the *Preface* to the *Lovain Bibles*. And although the *Pope ex Apoſtolicæ poteſtatis plenitudine* (as *Sixtus* 5. phraſeth it in the *Bull* before his *Bibles*) did take and leave where he pleaſed himſelf, yet it is evident from thoſe who have compared them, that above two thouſand places are reformed according to the *Originals*; and more than twice as many more might have been if his Holineſs had thought good. For our induſtrious Dr. *James*, who had taken the pains accurately to compare not only the *Sixtine* and *Clementine Bibles*, but the *Clementine* edition with the *Lovain Annotations*, doth in the defence of his *Bellum Papale* challenge *Gretſer* the *Jeſuite* to joyn *iſſue* with him if he dared on the point, *viz.* of making it appear that there were 10000. *differences* in the *Lovain Annotations* from the *Vulgar Latin*, and that theſe differences ariſe from the comparing it with the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Chaldee*. Are we not then at a fine paſs for our *Infallible certainty* concerning the *Copies* of *Scripture*, if the judgement of your *Church* muſt be relyed on? Was that ſufficient ground for *Pope Clement* to reform two thouſand places, and would it not ſerve for all the reſt? If thoſe were truer becauſe they *agreed* more with the *Originals*, were not the *reſt* ſo too? And have not we the greateſt reaſon to rely on the *Originals* when the *Pope* himſelf appeals to them, and reforms by them? According then to the judgement of your pretended *Infallible Church* we have as great *certainty* as they, for certainly the *Hebrew* and *Greek* are as obvious to us as them; and I never yet heard that your *Popes* did challenge to themſelves among other *Apoſtolical prerogatives the gift of tongues*.

p. 49.

2. *We may be ſufficiently aſſured that there are no material corruptions in the Books of Scripture without your Churches teſtimony.* Not that we pretend the *Apoſtles Autographa* are ſtill extant for us to compare our *Copies* with (although ſome of your ſide tell us among other rarities of the *Vatican*, that the true ancient *Greek* text is there extant, which the *Pope* would do well to oblige the world with) but we whoſe eyes are not *bleſt* with ſuch noble *ſights* as are there *lockt* up from all ſuch who have not a good *doſe* of implicite Faith about them, pretend to no ſuch thing: but by the diligent comparing the preſent *Copies* with the moſt ancient *MSS.* by the obſervation of what *Citations* of *Scripture* are produced by thoſe of the *Fathers* who lived when ſome of theſe *Autographa* were extant (as it is apparent ſome were in *Tertullians* time, and ſome tell us that the authentick *Apocalypſe* was preſerved in the *Church* of *Epheſus* in *Honorius* his time) by the diligence of the primitive *writers* in taking notice of the leaſt attempt for falſification or corruption of the text; For when *Marcion* began to clip and falſifie the text, *Irenæus* preſently takes notice of it and gives him a ſufficient rebuke for it: and ſo doth *Tertullian* afterwards, and *Epiphanius* particularly takes notice of all thoſe places which had violent hands laid upon them, and reſcues them from thoſe impure attempts, ſo that we ſtill enjoy them in their integrity. So that whatever endeavours were made, they were preſently diſcovered, as that of the *Arrians* by St. *Ambroſe*, that of *Tatianus* his *Monoteſſaron* by *Theodoret*. In ſo much, that *Bellarmin* himſelf confeſſeth; *Etſi multa depravare conati ſunt hæretici, tamen nunquam defuerunt Catholici, qui eorum corruptelas detexerint, & non permiſerint libros ſacros corrumpi.* That the *Catholicks* were as vigilant as the *Hereticks malicious*, and therefore could never effect their deſign in corrupting the *Scripture*. Beſides, it is obſervable, that among thoſe *multitudes* of *various lections* in the *New Teſtament*, of which *R. Stephen* made a colle-

Bailius contr. Catech. q. 15. tr. 1. Huntl. Controv. 1. c. 13. ſect. 9.

Iren. l. 1. c. 29. Tertul. c. Marcion. l. 5. Epiph. hæreſ. 42.

Ambroſ. de Sp. S. l. 3. c. 11. Theodoret. de hæret. Fab. l. 1. Bellar. l. 2. de V. D. c. 7.

collection out of ſixteen *MSS.* of 2384. (which probably were occaſioned by the general diſperſion of Copies, and the multitudes of tranſcriptions by ſuch as were either ignorant or careleſs) yet there are none which are *material*, ſo as to entrench upon the integrity and authority of the *Copies* as a rule of *Faith and Manners*; they are therefore but *racings* of the *skin*, but no *wounds* of any vital part. Abating therefore only what muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed in the multitudes of *Copies* tranſcribed, there is ſo great *integrity* and *incorruption* in thoſe *Copies* we have, that we cannot but therein take notice of a peculiar hand of *Divine Providence* in preſerving theſe *authentick records* of our Religion ſo ſafe to our dayes. But it is time now to return to you.

You would therefore perſwade us, *That we have no ground of certainty as to the Copies of Scripture, but comparing them with the Apoſtles Autographa*; but I hope our former diſcourſe hath given you a ſufficient account of our *certainty* without ſeeing the *Apoſtles own hands*. But I pray what certainty then had the *Jews* after the Captivity, of their *Copies* of the *Law*? yet I cannot think you will deny them any ground of certainty in the time of *Chriſt* that they had the true Copies both of the *Law* and the *Prophets*; and I hope you will not make the *Sanhedrin*, which condemned our *Saviour* to death, to have given them their only *Infallible certainty* concerning it. If therefore the *Jews* might be certain without *Infallibility*, why may not we? for if the *Oracles of God* were *committed to the Jews then*, they are to the *Chriſtians* now.

§. 8. P. 83. You yet further urge, *That there can be no certainty concerning the Autographa's of the Apoſtles, but by tradition: And may not every univerſal tradition be carried up as clearly at leaſt to the Apoſtles times, as the Scriptures; by moſt credible Authors, who wrote in their reſpective ſucceeding ages?* I anſwer, We grant there can be no certainty as to the *Copies* of *Scripture* but from *tradition*, and if you can name any of thoſe great things in Controverſie between us, which you will undertake to prove to be as *univerſal* a *tradition*, as that of the *Scriptures*; you and I ſhall not differ as to the belief of it. But think not to fob us off with the tradition of the *preſent Church* inſtead of the *Church of all ages*, with the *tradition* of your *Church* inſtead of the *Catholick*, with the ambiguous *teſtimonies* of *two* or *three* of the *Fathers*, inſtead of the *univerſal conſent of the Church ſince the Apoſtles times*. If I ſhould once ſee you prove the *Infallibility of your Church*, the *Popes Supremacy*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Images*, the *neceſſity* of *Cœlibate in the Clergy*, a *punitive Purgatory*, the *lawfulneſs of communicating in one kind*, the *expediency of the Scriptures and Prayers being in an unknown tongue*, the *ſacrifice of the Maſs*, *Tranſubſtantiation* (to name no more) by as *unqueſtionable* and *univerſal a tradition* as that whereby we receive the *Scriptures*, I ſhall extol you for the only perſon that ever did any thing conſiderable on your ſide, and I ſhall willingly yield my ſelf up as a *Trophey* to your brave attempts. Either then for ever forbear to mention any ſuch things, as *Univerſal Tradition among you* as to any things, beſides *Scriptures*, which carry a neceſſity with them of being believed or practiſed; or once for all undertake this task, and manifeſt it as to the things in Controverſie between us. Your next Paragraph (beſides what hath been already diſcuſſed in this Chapter concerning *Apoſtolical tradition* of Scripture) empties it ſelf into the old *mare mortuum* of the *formal object and Infallible application of Faith*, which I cannot think my ſelf ſo much at leaſure to follow you into, ſo often as you fall into it. When once you bring any thing that hath but the leaſt reſemblance of *reaſon* more than before, I ſhall afreſh conſider it, but not till then. What next follows *concerning reſolving Faith into prime Apoſtolical Tradition infallibly*,

without the Infallibility of the preſent Church, hath been already prevented by telling you, that his Lordſhip doth not ſay, That the *infallible Reſolution of Faith is into that Apoſtolical Tradition, but into the Doctrine which is conveyed in the Books of Scripture from the Apoſtles times down to us, by an unqueſtionable Tradition.* Your ſtale Objection, *That then we ſhould want Divine Certainty*, hath been over and over anſwered; and ſo hath your next Paragraph, *That if the Church be not infallible, we cannot be infallibly certain, that Scripture is Gods Word:* and ſo the remainder concerning *Canonical Books*. It is an eaſie matter to write great Books after that rate, to ſwell up your diſcourſes with needleſs repetitions; but it is the miſery that attends a *bad cauſe*, and a *bad ſtomach*, to have *unconcocted things* brought up ſo often, till we *nauſeate* them.

Pag. 84.

§. 9. Your next offer is at the *Vindication* of the noted *place* of S. *Auſtin, I would not believe the Goſpel, &c. which* (you ſay) *cannot rationally be underſtood of Novices, Weaklings, and Doubters in the Faith.* This being then the place at every turn objected by you, and having before reſerved the diſcuſſion of it to this place, I ſhall here particularly and throughly conſider the meaning of it. In order to which, three things muſt be enquired into.

1. *What the Controverſie was which S.* Auſtin *was there diſcuſſing of?*
2. *What that Church was which S.* Auſtin *was moved by the Authority of?*
3. *In what way and manner that Churches Authority did perſwade him?*

1. Nothing ſeems more neceſſary for underſtanding the meaning of this place, than a true *ſtate* of the *Controverſie*, which S. *Auſtin* was diſputing of; and yet nothing leſs ſpoke to on either ſide, than this hath been. We are therefore to conſider, that when *Manes* or *Manichæus* began to appear in the world, to broach that ſtrange and abſurd Doctrine of his in the *Chriſtian* world, which he had received from *Terebinthus* or *Buddas*, as he from *Scythianus* (who, if we believe *Epiphanius*, went to *Jeruſalem* in the *Apoſtles* times, to enquire into the Doctrine of Chriſtianity, and diſpute with the *Chriſtians* about his Opinions) but eaſily foreſeeing what little entertainment ſo ſtrange a complexion of abſurdities would find in the *Chriſtian world*, as long as the writings of the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts* were received everywhere with that eſteem and veneration: Two wayes he, or his more cunning Diſciples, bethought themſelves of, whereby to leſſen the authority of thoſe writings, and ſo make way for the Doctrine of *Manichæus*. One was to diſparage the *Credulity* of *Chriſtians*, becauſe the *Catholick Church* inſiſted ſo much on the neceſſity of *Faith*, whereas they pretended they would deſire men to believe nothing but what they gave them ſufficient reaſon for. But all this while, ſince the *Chriſtians* thought they had evident reaſon for believing the *Scriptures*, and conſequently none to believe the Doctrine which did oppoſe them; therefore they found it neceſſary to go further, and to charge thoſe *Copies* of *Scripture* with falſifications and corruptions, which were generally received among *Chriſtians*. But theſe are fully delivered by S. *Auſtin* in his Book *de utilitate credendi*, as will appear to any one who looks into it; but the latter is that which I aim at; this he therefore taxeth them for, *That with a great deal of impudence, or, to ſpeak mildly, with much weakneſs, they charged the Scriptures to be corrupted; and yet could not at ſo ſmall a diſtance of time prove any corruption by any Copies which were extant. For,* ſaith he, *if they ſhould ſay, They would not embrace their writings, becauſe they were written by ſuch who were not careful of writing Truth, their evaſion would be more ſhy, and their errour more pardonable.* But thus, it ſeems, they did by the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, utterly denying them to contain matter of Truth in them; and the reaſon was very obvious for it, becauſe that *Book* gives ſo clear an account

Epiph. hæreſ. 66.

Nihil mihi videtur ab iis impudentius dici, vel ut mitius loquar, incuriuſius & imbecillius, quam Scripturas divinas eſſe corruptas, cum id nullis, in tam recenti memoriâ, extantibus exemplaribus poſſint convincere. D. Auguſt. de Utilit. cred. c. 3.

count of the ſending the *Spirit* upon the *Apoſtles*, which the *Manichees* pretended was to be only accompliſhed in the perſon of *Manichæus*. And both before and after, S. *Auſtin* mentions it as their common ſpeech, *That before the time of* Manichæus, *there had been corrupters of the ſacred Books, who had mixed ſeveral things of their own with what was written by the Apoſtles.* And this they laid upon the *Judaizing Chriſtians*, becauſe their great *pique* was againſt the *Old Teſtament*, and probably ſome further reaſon might be from the *Nazarene Goſpel*; wherein many things were inſerted by ſuch as did *Judaize*. The ſame thing S. *Auſtin* chargeth them with, when he gives an account of their Hereſie. And this likewiſe appears by the management of the diſpute between S. *Auſtin* and *Fauſtus*, who was much the ſubtileſt man among them. Fauſtus *acknowledged no more to be Goſpel, than what contained the Doctrine delivered by our Saviour, and therefore denied the Genealogies to be any part of the Goſpel*; and afterwards diſputes againſt them, both in S. *Matthew*, and S. *Luke*. And after this S. *Auſtin* notes it *as their uſual cuſtome, when they could not avoid a Teſtimony of Scripture, to deny it.* Thus we ſee, what kind of perſons theſe were, and what their pretences were which S. *Auſtin* diſputes againſt, *They embraced ſo much of Scripture, as pleaſed them, and no more.* To this therefore S. *Auſtin* returns theſe very ſubſtantial Anſwers, *That if ſuch proceedings might be admitted, the Divine Authority of any Books could ſignifie nothing at all for the convincing of errours. That it was much more reaſonable, either with the Pagans, to deny the whole Bible, or with the Jews, to deny the New Teſtament, than thus to acknowledge in general the Books Divine, and to quarrel with ſuch particular paſſages as pinched them moſt; that if there were any ſuſpicion of corruption, they ought to produce more true Copies, and more ancient Books than theirs, or elſe be judged by the Original Languages, with many other things to the ſame purpoſe.* To apply this now to the preſent place in diſpute, S. *Auſtin* in that *Book* againſt the *Epiſtle* of *Manichæus*, begins with the *Preface* to it, which is made in imitation of the *Apoſtles ſtrain*, and begins thus, *Manichæus Apoſtolus Jeſu Chriſti, providentiâ Dei Patris, &c.* To this S. *Auſtin* ſaith, *he believes no ſuch thing, as that* Manichæus *was an Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, and hopes they will not be angry with him for it; for he had learned of them not to believe without reaſon.* And therefore deſires them to prove it: *It may be* (ſaith he) *one of you may read me the Goſpel, and thence perſwade me to believe it. But, what if you ſhould meet with one, who, when you read the Goſpel, ſhould ſay to you, I do not believe it? But, I ſhould not believe the Goſpel, if the Authority of the Church did not move me: Whom therefore I obey in ſaying, Believe the Goſpel, ſhould I not obey in ſaying, Believe not* Manichæus? The *Queſtion*, we ſee, is concerning the proving the *Apoſtleſhip of Manichæus*, which cannot in it ſelf be proved, but from ſome *Records*, which muſt ſpecifie ſuch an *Apoſtleſhip* of his; and to any one who ſhould queſtion the *authenticalneſs* of thoſe *Records*, it can only be proved by the teſtimony and conſent of the *Catholick Church*, without which S. *Auſtin* profeſſeth, he ſhould never have believed the *Goſpel*, i. e. *that theſe were the only true and undoubted Records, which are left us of the Doctrine and actions of Chriſt.* And he had very good reaſon to ſay ſo; for otherwiſe the *au-*

Quam multa ſolent dicere immixta eſſe ſcripturis divinis, à neſcio quibus corruptoribus veritatis.
Volunt enim neſcio quos corruptores divinorum librorum ante ipſius Manichæi tempora fuiſſe. Id. ib.
Corripiſſe autem illos, qui Judæorum legem Evangelio miſcere cupiebant.

Ipſiuſq; Novi Teſtamenti Scripturas tanquam infuſatas ita legunt, ut quod voluerint inde accipiant, quod nolunt rejiciant. Aug. hæret. 46.
Evangelium quidem à prædicatione Chriſti & eſſe cœpit & nominari: at verò Genealogia adeò non eſt Evangelium, ut nec ipſe ejus ſcriptor auſus fuerit eam Evangelium nominare Fauſtus apud Auguſt. c. Fauſtum l. 2. init. l. 3. init. l. 5. init.
ubi ſic manifeſtâ veritate iſti præfocantur ut obteſti de lucidis verbis Sanctarum Scripturarum, exitum in ſua fallaciæ ſuæ reperire non poſſint; id teſtimonium, quod prolatum eſt, falſum eſſe reſpondent, c. Fauſtum. l. 11. c. 2.

Quæ autoritas literarum aperiri, quis ſacer liber evolvi, quod documentum cujuſlibet Scripturæ ad convincendos errores exeri poteſt, ſi hæc vox admittitur, ſi alicujus ponderis æſtimatur? Id. ib.

Si ergo invenires aliquem, qui Evangelio non tum credit, quid faceres dicenti tibi, Non credo? Ego verò Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Catholicæ eccleſiæ commoveret auctoritas. Quibus ergo obtemperavi dicentibus, Credite Evangelio, cur eis non obtemperem dicentibus mihi, Noli credere Manichæo? c. Ep. Fundam. c. 5.

thority of thoſe Books ſhould be queſtioned every time any one, ſuch as *Manichæus*, ſhould pretend himſelf an *Apoſtle:* which Controverſies there can be no other way of deciding, but by the *Teſtimony* of the *Church*, which hath received and embraced theſe *Copies* from the time of their firſt publiſhing. And that this was S. *Auſtin*'s meaning, will appear by ſeveral parallel places in his *diſputes* againſt the *Manichees*. For in the ſame chapter, ſpeaking concerning the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, *Which Book* (ſaith he) *I muſt believe, as well as the Goſpel, becauſe the ſame Catholick Authority commends both: i. e.* The ſame *Teſtimony* of the *Univerſal Church*, which delivers the *Goſpel* as the *authentick writings of the Evangeliſts*, doth likewiſe deliver the *Acts of the Apoſtles for an authentick writing of one of the ſame Evangeliſts:* So that there can be no reaſon to believe the one, and not the other. So when he diſputes againſt *Fauſtus*, who denied the truth of ſome things in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles; he bids him ſhew a *truer Copy* than that the *Catholick Church* received, which *Copy* if he ſhould produce, he deſires to know how he would prove it to be *truer* to one that ſhould deny it. *What would you do?* (ſaith he) *Whither would you turn your ſelf? What Original of your Book could you ſhew? What Antiquity, what Teſtimony of a ſucceſſion of perſons from the time of the writing of it?* But on the contrary, *What huge advantage the Catholicks have, who, by a conſtant ſucceſſion of Biſhops in the Apoſtolical Sees, and by the conſent of ſo many people, have the Authority of the Church confirmed to them for the clearing the validity of its Teſtimony concerning the Records of Scripture.* And after layes down Rules for the *trying of Copies*, where there appears any difference between them, viz. *by comparing them with the Copies of other Countries, from whence the Doctrine originally came; and if thoſe Copies vary too, the more Copies ſhould be preferred before the fewer, the ancienter before the latter: If yet any uncertainty remains, the original Language muſt be conſulted.* This is, in caſe a Queſtion ariſeth among the acknowledged authentical *Copies* of the *Catholick Church*, (in which caſe we ſee, he never ſends men to the *infallible Teſtimony of the Church*, for certainty as to the *Truth* of the *Copies*) but if the Queſtion be, Whether any *writing* it ſelf be *authentical* or no, then it ſtands to the greateſt reaſon, that the Teſtimony of the *Catholick Church* ſhould be relyed on, which, by reaſon of its *large ſpread*, and continual *Succeſſion* from the very time of thoſe *writings*, cannot but give the moſt indubitable Teſtimony concerning the *authenticalneſs* of the *writings* of the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts*. And were it not for this Teſtimony, S. *Auſtin* might juſtly ſay, *He ſhould not believe the Goſpel, i. e.* Suppoſe thoſe writings which contain the *Goſpel* in them (for it is plain he ſpeaks of *them*, and not the *Doctrine* abſtractly conſidered) ſhould have wanted that *conſent* of the *Catholick Church*, that it had not been delivered down by a conſtant ſucceſſion of all Ages from the *Apoſtles*, and were not received among the *Chriſtian Churches*, but ſtarted out from a few perſons who differ from all *Chriſtian Churches*, as this *Apoſtleſhip* of *Manichæus* did; he might juſtly queſtion the *Truth* of them. And this I take to be the trueſt and moſt natural account of theſe ſo much controverted words of S. *Auſtin*; by which ſenſe the other two Queſtions are eaſily anſwered: for it is plain, S. *Auſtin* means not the *judgement of the preſent Church*, but of the *Catholick Church*, in the moſt comprehenſive ſenſe, as taking in all *ages and places*, or in *Vincentius* his words, *Succeſſion, Univerſality*, and *Conſent*; and it further appears,

Cui libro neceſſe eſt me credere, ſi credo Evangelio; quoniam utramq; Scripturam ſimiliter mihi Catholica commendat authoritas. Ib.

Quid agis? quò te convertes? quam libri à te prolati originem, quam vetuſtatem, quam ſeriem ſucceſſionis teſtem citabis? A g. c. Fauſtum, l. 11. c. 2.

Et vides in hâc re quid Eccleſiæ Catholicæ valeat authoritas, quæ ab ipſis fundatiſſimis ſedibus Apoſtolorum uſq; ad hodiernum diem ſuccedentium ſibimet Epiſcoporum ſerie, & tot populorum conſenſione firmatur. Id. ib.

Ita ſi de fide exemplarium quæſtio verteretur ſicut in nonnullis, quæ & paucæ ſunt, & Sacrarum Literarum ſtudioſis notiſſimæ ſententiarum varietates, vel ex aliarum Regionum codicibus, unde ipſa Doctrina commeavit, noſtra dubitatio dijudicaretur: vel, ſi ibi quoque codices variarent, plures paucioribus, aut vetuſtiores recentioribus præferrentur: & ſi adhuc incerta varietas, præcedens lingua unde illud interpretatum eſt conſuleretur. Id. ib.

pears, that the influence which this Authority hath, is ſufficient to induce Aſſent to the thing atteſted in all perſons who conſider it, in what age, capacity, or condition ſoever. And therefore, if in this ſenſe you extend it beyond *Novices and Weaklings*, I ſhall not oppoſe you in it.; but it cannot be denied, that it is intended chiefly for *doubters in the Faith*, becauſe the deſign of it is to give men ſatisfaction as to the *reaſon* why they ought to *believe*. But neither you, nor any of thoſe you call *Catholick Authors*, will ever be able to prove, that S. *Auſtin* by theſe words ever dreamt of any *infallible Authority in the preſent Church*, as might be abundantly proved from the Chapter foregoing, where he gives an account of his being in the *Catholick Church*, from the *Conſent of People and Nations, from that Authority which was begun by miracles, nouriſhed by hope, increaſed by charity, confirmed by continuance*, which certainly are not the expreſſions of one who reſolved his Faith into the *infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church*. And the whole ſcope and deſign of his Book *de utilitate credendi*, doth evidently refute any ſuch apprehenſion, as might be eaſily manifeſted, were it not too large a ſubject for this place, where we only examine the meaning of S. *Auſtin* in another Book. The ſubſtance of which is, that That ſpeech of his doth not contain a *reſolution of his Faith*, as to the *Divinity of Chriſts Doctrine*; but the *reſolution* of it, as to the *Truth* and *authenticalneſs* of the *writings* of the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts*, which we acknowledge to be into the Teſtimony of the *Catholick Church*, in the moſt large and comprehenſive ſenſe.

The next thing we come to conſider, is, an Abſurdity you charge on his *Lordſhip, viz. That if the infallible Authority of the Church be not admitted in the Reſolution, he muſt have recourſe to the private Spirit, which* (you ſay) *though he would ſeem to exclude from the ſtate of the Queſtion, yet he falls into it under the ſpecious title of Grace; ſo that he only changeth the words, but admits the ſame thing*, for which you cite p. 83, 84. *That therein his Lordſhip ſhould averr, that where others uſed to ſay, They were infallibly reſolved that Scripture was Gods Word, by the Teſtimony of the Spirit within them, that he hath the ſame aſſurance by Grace.* Whether you be not herein guilty of abuſing his Lordſhip by a plain perverting of his meaning, will be beſt ſeen by producing his words. *A man* (ſaith he) *is probably led by the Authority of the preſent Church, as by the firſt informing, inducing, perſwading means, to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God: But, when he hath ſtudied, conſidered, and compared this Word with it ſelf, and with other writings, with the help of ordinary Grace, and a mind morally induced, and reaſonably perſwaded by the Voice of the Church, the Scripture then gives greater and higher reaſons of Credibility to it ſelf, than Tradition alone could give. And then he that believes, reſolves his laſt and full aſſent, that Scripture is of Divine Authority, into internal arguments found in the letter it ſelf, though found by the help and direction of Tradition without, and Grace within.* Had you not a great mind to calumniate, who could pick out of theſe words, *That the Biſhop reſolved his Faith into Grace?* Can any thing be more plain, than the contrary is from them, when in the moſt perſpicuous terms he ſays, *that the laſt Reſolution of Faith is into internal arguments, and only ſuppoſeth Tradition and Grace as neceſſary helps for the finding them?* Might you not then as well have ſaid, That his Lordſhip, notwithſtanding his zeal againſt the *Infallibility of Tradition*, is fain to reſolve his *Faith* into it at laſt, as well as ſay, that he doth it *into Grace*; for he joyns theſe two together? But, Is it not poſſible to aſſert the *Uſe* and *Neceſſity* of *Grace*, in order to *Faith*, but the laſt Reſolution of it muſt be into it? Do not all your *Divines*, as well as ours, *ſuppoſe* and *prove* the *Neceſſity of Grace*, in order to *believing*; and, Are they not equally guilty of having recourſe to the *private Spirit?* Do you really think your ſelf, that there is any thing of

§. 10. P. 85. n. 3.

P. 83.

Divine

Divine Grace in Faith or no? If there be, free your Self then from the *private Spirit*, and you do his Lordſhip. For ſhame then forbear ſuch pitiful calumnies; which, if they have any truth in them, You are as much concerned as Your adverſary in it. You would next perſwade us, *That the Relator never comes near the main difficulty, which* (ſay you) *is, if the Church be ſuppoſed fallible in the Tradition of Scripture, how it ſhall be certainly known, whether* de facto, *ſhe now errs not in her delivery of it?* If this be your grand difficulty, it is ſufficiently aſſoiled already, having largely anſwered this Queſtion *in terminis*, in the preceding Chapter.

You ask further, *What they are to do who are unreſolved which is the true Church*; as though it were neceſſary for men to know which is the *true Church*, before they can believe the *Scriptures to be the Word of God?* But when we aſſert the *tradition of the Church* to be *neceſſary* for believing the *Scriptures*, we do not thereby underſtand the particular *Tradition* of any particular *Church* whoſe judgement they muſt rely on, but the *Univerſal Tradition* of all *Chriſtians*, though this muſt be firſt made known in ſome particular Society, by the means of ſome *particular perſons*, though their *authority* doth not oblige us to believe, but only are the means whereby men come acquainted with that *Univerſal Tradition*. And therefore your following diſcourſe *concerning the knowing the true Church by its motives is ſuperſeded*; for we mean no other *Church* than the *Community of Chriſtians* in this Controverſie; and, if you ask me, *By what motives I come to be certain which is a Community of Chriſtians, and which of Mahumetans, and how one ſhould be known from another*, I can ſoon reſolve you: But we are ſo far from making it neceſſary to know *which particular ſociety of Chriſtians* in oppoſition to others, is the *true Church* for reſolving this queſtion, that we look on it as a great argument of the *Credibility* as well as *Univerſality* of this *Tradition*, that all theſe differing *Societies* conſent in it. And not only they, but the greateſt oppoſers of *Chriſtianity*, *Jews*, or *Philoſophers*, could never ſee any reaſon to call in queſtion ſuch a *Tradition*.

His Lordſhip the better to repreſent *the uſe of Tradition* in the laſt reſolution of Faith makes *uſe of this illuſtration, That as the knowledge of Grammer and Logick is neceſſary in order to the making a Demonſtration, yet the knowledge of the Concluſion is not reſolved into Grammar or Logick, but into the immediate principles out of which it is deduced: So a mans firſt preparative to Faith is the Churches Tradition, but his full and laſt aſſent is reſolved into the internal arguments of Scripture.* This you quarrel with,
P. 86. and tell us, *There is not the ſame Analogy between Logick and Church-Tradition*; your meaning, I ſuppoſe is, becauſe *Logick* doth *Phyſically* by inlarging the underſtanding fit men for *demonſtrations*, but *Church-Tradition* cannot enable men to underſtand the *Scripture*. But cannot you eaſily diſcern that *Analogy* which his Lordſhip brought this illuſtration for, which is, that ſome things may be neceſſary *preparatives* for knowledge, which that *knowledge* is not reſolved into. Is not this plain in *Logick*, and is it not as plain between *Tradition* and *Scripture*? For though *Tradition* doth not open our *eyes* to ſee this light, yet it preſents the object to us to be ſeen, and that in an unqueſtionable manner. *But for all this*, ſay you, *a man muſt either receive it on the ſole authority of Church-Tradition, or be as much in the dark as ever.* Why ſo? Is there any repugnancy in the thing, that Scripture ſhould be received firſt upon the account of Tradition, and yet afterwards men reſolve their Faith into the *Scripture* it ſelf? May not a man very probably believe that a *Diamond* is ſent him from a Friend upon the teſtimony of the *Meſſenger* who brings it, and yet be firmly perſwaded of it, by diſcerning the *Sparklings* of it? *But*, ſay you
P. 86. l. 33, 34. further, *The Scriptures themſelves appear no more to be the Word of God, than*

the

the Stars to be of a certain determinate number, or the diſtinction of colours to a blind man. If this approach not to the higheſt blaſphemy againſt the *Scripture*, I know not what doth. He that ſhall compare this ſaying of yours, with that in the precedent Chapter, *That if Chriſt had not left the Church Infallible, he might be accounted an Impoſtor and Deceiver*, may eaſily gueſs how much of *Religion* you believe in your heart, when on ſo ſmall occaſions you do ſo openly diſparage both *Chriſt* and the *Scriptures*. It is well yet, your *Churches* Infallibility can ſtand on no better terms than theſe are, which will be ſufficient to keep any who have any true ſenſe of the *truth* and *excellency* of *Chriſt* and the *Scriptures* from hearkening to it. But are you in good earneſt when you ſay, that *Scriptures themſelves appear no more to be the Word of God, than the diſtinction of colours to a blind man*, which is as much as nothing at all? Is there *nothing* at all in the *excellency* of the *Doctrine* and *Precepts* contained in the *Scriptures*, *nothing* in thoſe clear *diſcoveries* of *God* and our *ſelves*, *nothing* in all thoſe *tranſactions* between *God* and men, *nothing* in that *Covenant* of Redemption between *God* and *man* through *Chriſt*, *nothing* in the clear *accompliſhment* and *fulfilling* of *Prophecies*, *nothing* in that admirable *ſtrain* and *ſtyle* which is in the writings, *nothing* in that harmonious *conſent* which is diſcovered in writers of ſeveral ages, intereſts, places, and conditions, *nothing* in that *admirable efficacy* which the *Doctrine* of it hath upon the ſouls of men to perſwade them to renounce ſin, the world, and themſelves for the ſake of it; is there *nothing* more (I ſay) in all theſe, which makes the *Scripture* appear to be the *Word of God, than the diſtinction of colours to a blind man?* Could you aſſoon think *to account the ſtars* as diſcern any thing of *Divinity* from theſe things in the *Scriptures?* If your *eyes* were as *blind* as your *underſtanding*, could you aſſoon diſtinguiſh *white* from *black*, as the *Scripture* from the *Alcoran*, if they were both preſented to you to read, and judge of them according to the evidence you found in them? Is it poſſible a man that owns himſelf a *Chriſtian*, ſhould utter ſuch opprobrious language of the *Scripture?* You had been before ſpeaking *what honour you give to the Scripture*, notwithſtanding you pretend your *Church Infallible*, and I had mentioned ſome of thoſe paſſages which occurr in your writers in diſparagement of them: but I muſt needs ſay they all fall ſhort of this; the *Noſe of Wax*, the *Inky Divinity*, the *Lesbian rule*, are *Courtlike expreſſions* to this of yours; for this puts no difference in the world between the *Scripture* and the *Alcoran*, if your *Church* ſhould propound the one as well as the other. For you could not poſſibly ſay worſe of the *Alcoran*, than *that of it ſelf it appeared no more to be the Word of God, than diſtinction of colours to a blind man.* I might here ſend you to be chaſtiſed for this inſolent *Atheiſtical* expreſſion to the Primitive *Fathers*, who ſpeak ſo much in admiration of the *excellency* of *Scriptures*, who did vindicate them from all aſſaults of the *Heathen Philoſophers*. I might ſend you to thoſe of your own party, who if they have any love or tenderneſs for *Chriſtian Religion* will not ſuffer ſuch paſſages to paſs without the moſt ſevere rebukes: I might ſufficiently prove the contrary from the arguments uſed againſt *Atheiſts* by *Bellarmine* and others; but I ſhall content my ſelf with that noble and Chriſtian confeſſion of your *Gregory de Valentia*, from whom you might learn more piety and modeſty towards the Sacred *Scriptures*. *There being many things in the Doctrine of Chriſtianity it ſelf, which of themſelves may conciliate belief and authority, yet that ſeems*

Cum multa ſint in ipſâ Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ quæ ipſa per ſe fidem illi & autoritatem conciliare poſſint, tamen mihi maximum illud eſſe videtur, (ut à Clement. Alex. & à Lactant. & ab aliis eſt obſervatum) quod ſuâ neſcio quâ admirabili vi, divinè prorſus hominum animos afficit, atque ad virtutem impellit. Eſt ſcripta verbis ſimplicibus, & caret ferè artificio orationis & ornamentis; nihilominus ita vehementer lectoris mentem commovet, ut nulla aliæ doctrinæ. Quod argumento eſt, illius autoritatem omnino Divinam eſſe, & non humanam; hæc enim ſine verborum arte, & orationis quaſi lenociniis, ad efficiendum animorum motum non valet. Greg. de Valentiâ, Analyſ. fidei. l. 1. c. 25.

the

the greateſt to me (as hath been obſerved by Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius and others) that I know not with what admirable force, but moſt divine, it affects the hearts of men, and ſtirs them up to vertue. It is written with great ſimplicity, and without almoſt any artifice or ornament of ſpeech; which is an argument that its authority is not humane but Divine, for no humane writing hath any power on the minds of men without a great deal of art and eloquence. How many things are there in this ingenuous and pious confeſſion of this learned *Jeſuite*, which might, if you have any ſhame left, make you ſenſible of the Blaſphemy of your former expreſſion? For, 1. He ſaith, there are many things in the *doctrine* of *Chriſtianity* which *for themſelves* may conciliate our belief, and manifeſt their authority: If *for themſelves*, then certainly the *Scriptures of themſelves* have a great deal more evidence, that they are *the Word of God, than the diſtinction of colours to a blind man.* 2. That the peculiar *ſtrain* and *genius* of *Scripture* argues ſomething *Divine* in it, becauſe, notwithſtanding its ſimplicity it hath ſo great power and efficacy on the minds of men; far beyond any humane art or *Rhetorick.* 3. That this may be diſcerned in the very *Books* of *Scripture* without the ſuppoſition of the authority of any *Church*; for he mentions the Doctrine meerly as written, and what may be found by the reading of it. Go then, and learn ſome piety and ingenuity (where it is ſo ſeldome to be learned) from a *Jeſuite*, and think not that we ſhall ever have the meaner thoughts of the *Scripture* for ſuch bold expreſſions; but, we can eaſily ſee, that the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, and the *Honour* of *Scripture* cannot poſſibly ſtand together.

Your ſubſequent diſcourſe conſiſts of ſome rare pieces of ſubtilty, which may be reſolved into theſe conſequences: If your *Church of* Rome *hath erred as to the number of Canonical Books*, then *the Catholick Church, ever ſince Chriſts time, hath erred*; if *the Church may erre, then we cannot be certain but ſhe hath erred*; if *we can have no infallible certainty, then we can have none at all*; Theſe conſequences your diſcourſe to n. 5. may be reſolved into; and make good ever a one of them, I will ſay you have proved ſomething; which is more than you have done yet.

§. 11. P. 87. N. 5. You object againſt his Lordſhip, *That he requires ſo many things in order to the reſolution of Faith, that he makes none capable of it, but men of extraordinary parts and learning.* To which I anſwer, that his Lordſhip is not undertaking to give an account of the *Faith* of *rude or illiterate perſons*, but ſuch a one as may ſatisfie men of parts and learning, *i. e.* he endeavoured to lay down the *true rational account* of it, and not to enquire how far *God* obligeth every man that comes to Heaven, to a *critical Reſolution* of his *Faith.* And therefore for the generality of ſuch perſons who heartily believe the *Truth of Scriptures*, but are not able to give a clear and ſatisfactory account of it to others; I anſwer, as S. *Auſtin* did in the ſame caſe, *Cæteram quippe turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, ſed credendi ſimplicitas tutiſſimam facit:* That *God* requires not from the common ſort of believers, the *ſubtilty of Speculation, but the ſimplicity of Faith*; which may be very firm even in them from the reading of *Scriptures*, and hearing the *Doctrine* of it plainly delivered to them, though they are not able to give ſuch accounts of their Faith, which may be ſatisfactory to any but themſelves. So we ſay, *That the way is ſo plain, that mean capacities may not erre therein.* But, I wonder at you, of all men, that you ſhould charge our way with *intricacy*, who lead men into ſuch perplexities and difficulties, before they can be ſatisfied that they ought to believe; for to this end you make the *infallible Teſtimony* of the *Church* neceſſary; and, how many inſuperable difficulties are there before one can be aſſured of that? Firſt, he muſt know your *Church* to be the *True Church*, and this muſt be proved

Aug. c. ep. Fund. c. 4.

by

by a continual *ſucceſſion* of *Paſtors* in your *Church*, and by a *conformity* of your *Doctrine* with the *Ancients*; and, Do you think theſe two are not very eaſie introductions to *Faith*, like the taking *Rome* in ones way, to go from *York* to *London*; but, though a man ſhould pull down a *Houſe* to find a *Key* to open it, and after he had ſearched in all the rubbiſh of *antiquity*, find enough to perſwade him *yours* may be a *True Church*, yet he is as far from believing as ever, unleſs he finds a way through another *Trap-door* for his *Faith*, which is, that *yours*, though a particular *Church*, is yet the only *Catholick Church*, *i. e.* that the firſt *room* he comes in, is *infallibly* the *whole houſe*, and therefore he never needs look further. But, ſuppoſing this, yet if he doth not believe this *Church* to be *infallible* in *all* it ſays, he had as good never come into it; and therefore he muſt believe ſtrenuouſly, *That whatever it ſays, is infallibly True*, which being ſo hard a task (as for a man that ſees a houſe *half down* before his eyes, to believe it can never *fall*) it had need have ſome good *buttreſſes* to ſupport it, and at laſt finds nothing but ſome feeble *Motives of Credibility*, which ſignifie nothing as to the *Church*, but might have been ſtrong enough, if ſet in the right place, *viz.* not to ſupport the *Church*, but to prove the truth of Chriſtian Doctrine. Theſe, and many other *intrigues*, which I have formerly diſcovered, do unavoidably attend the reſolution of your *Faith*, among all perſons who profeſs to believe on the account of your *Churches Infallibility*.

What follows next concerning *Grace*, is already anſwered: What certainty we have that *Scripture* is of *Divine Revelation*, and conſequently what obligation lyes upon men to believe it, are things largely diſcourſed on in the beginning of this Chapter; and I ſhall ſuppoſe ſufficiently cleared, till you ſhew me reaſon to the contrary: By which it will appear (contrary to what follows n. 6.) that we have the *higheſt reaſons* or *motives of Credibility*, to aſſent to the *Truth*, and *Divine Authority of the Scriptures*.

§. 12. But you proceed to an attempt of ſomething new; which is, in a long harangue to diſprove his Lordſhips Opinion of *reſolving Faith* into that *Divine Light* which appears in *Scripture*. This you inſiſt on from n. 6. to n. 8. the ſubſtance of all which diſcourſe, I ſuppoſe, may be reduced to theſe three things. 1. *That though the Scripture be called a Light, yet that is to be underſtood only of thoſe who own its authority.* 2. *That the Scripture cannot ſhew it ſelf to be an Infallible Light.* 3. *That if there were ſuch Light in Scripture, all others would ſee it as well as he.* Before I come to a particular handling of each of theſe, it will be neceſſary to conſider, What it is which his Lordſhip means by this *Divine Light* in *Scripture*; for, there is nothing cauſeth more confuſion in the diſcourſes and apprehenſions of men, than the applying *Metaphors* taken from the *ſenſe* to the *acts* of the *Underſtanding*: For, by this means, we are apt to judge of our intellectual acts in a way wholly ſuitable to thoſe of *ſenſe*. We are not therefore to conceive, there can be any thing in *Divine Truths*, which ſo immediately doth diſcover it ſelf to the mind, as *light* doth to the *eye*. But that only which bears proportion to the *light* in the mind, is *reaſon*; for mens minds being *diſcurſive*, and not *intuitive*, they do not behold the truth of things by immediate *intuition*, but by ſuch *reaſon* and *arguments* as do induce and perſwade to aſſent. We are not therefore to imagine any ſuch *Light* in Scripture, that doth as immediately work upon the underſtanding, as the *Light* of the *Sun* doth on the organs of ſight; and therefore that common ſpeech, that *Light doth diſcover it ſelf as well as other things*, is in this ſenſe improperly applied to the Underſtanding; for, whatever is diſcovered to the mind in a *diſcurſive manner*, as all Objects of Faith are, muſt have ſome

antecedent *evidence* to it ſelf, which muſt be the ground of the act of aſſent. That therefore which is called the *Divine Light of Scripture*, is, I ſuppoſe that *rational evidence* which is contained in the *Books* of *Scripture*, whereby any reaſonable man may be perſwaded that theſe *Books* are of *Divine Authority*. Now that herein I ſay nothing beyond or beſides his Lordſhips meaning and intention, will appear by his own diſcourſe on this ſubject. For, 1. His Lordſhip deſignedly diſproves that Opinion that

p. 69. ſect. 16. n. 10. *Scripture ſhould be fully and ſufficiently known as by Divine and Infallible Teſtimony*, lumine proprio, *by the reſplendency of that Light which it hath in it ſelf only, and by the witneſs that it can ſo give to it ſelf. Becauſe, as there is no place in Scripture that tells us ſuch Books containing ſuch and ſuch particulars, are the Canon and Infallible Will of God; ſo, if there were any ſuch place, that could be no ſufficient proof*; for, *a man may juſtly ask another Book to bear witneſs to that, and ſo* in infinitum. *Again, this inbred Light of Scripture is a thing coincident with Scripture it ſelf, and ſo the Principles and the Concluſion in this kind of proof ſhould be entirely the ſame, which cannot be. Beſides, if this inward Light were ſo clear, how could there have been any variety among the ancient Believers, touching the authority of S.* James, *and S.* Judes *Epiſtles, and the Apocalypſe*, &c. *For certainly the Light which is in the Scripture, was the ſame then which now it is.* On theſe reaſons then, we ſee, his Lordſhip not only diſclaims, but diſproves ſuch knowing the Scripture meerly by the Light within. Two things then I hence infer, which will be very neceſſary to clear his Lordſhips meaning. 1. That he no where attributes ſuch an *inward Light* to *Scripture*, that *by it ſelf* it can diſcover that theſe *Books* are from *God*. 2. That where his Lordſhip mentions this *Light* moſt, he ſuppoſeth *Tradition* antecedent to it, as appears by his whole diſcourſe. From whence I gather this to have been the plaineſt account of his way of reſolving Faith, as I have already intimated, *viz.* that the *reſolution of Faith* may be conſidered two ways; into the *Books*, and into the *Doctrine* contained in them. The *reſolution* into the *Books*, muſt, of neceſſity, ſuppoſe *Tradition*, and rely upon it; and this kind of *reſolution* of *Faith*, cannot be into any *ſelf-evidence*, or *internal Light*: but, ſuppoſing the *Books* owned on the account of *Tradition*, if the Queſtion be concerning the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*, then he aſſerts, that the *reſolution* of this is into the *Divine Light* of Scripture, *i. e.* into that *rational evidence* which we find of the Divinity of it, in theſe Books which are owned on the account of Tradition.

p. 101. n. 32. And that this is his Lordſhips meaning, appears 2. By his own Teſtimony, who was beſt able to explain himſelf; for, when he goes about to confirm his Opinion by the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, he tells us, *This was the way which the ancient Church ever uſed, namely, Tradition, or Eccleſiaſtical Authority firſt, and then all other arguments, but eſpecially internal, from the Scripture it ſelf.* And, for this firſt, inſtanceth in S. *Auguſtine, who* (ſaith he) *gives four proofs all internal to the Scripture it ſelf, which are, Firſt, The Miracles. Secondly, That there is nothing carnal in the Doctrine. Thirdly, Fulfilling of Prophecies. Fourthly, The efficacy of it for converſion of the world.* All theſe we ſee he inſtanceth in, as internal arguments, and therefore make up that which he calls *Divine Light*. So that all that he means by this *Light of Scripture*, is only that *rational evidence* of the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*, which may be diſcovered in it, or deduced from it.

Having thus explained his Lordſhips meaning, it will be no matter of difficulty to return an Anſwer to the particulars by you alledged.

1. You ſay, *That when Scripture is ſaid to be a Light by the Royal Prophet, it is to be underſtood in this ſenſe, Becauſe, after we have once received it from the infallible Authority of the Church, it teacheth what we are to do and*

believe

believe. But, 1. Doth not the *Scripture* ſufficiently teach what we are to do and believe, ſuppoſing it not received on the infallible Authority of the Church? doth that add any thing to the *Light of Scripture?* Or, do you ſuppoſe the neceſſity of infallibly believing it on the *Churches Authority*, before one can diſcern what it teacheth us to do and believe?

2. What ground have you, in the leaſt, to imagine, that *David* ever believed the *Scripture* on the *infallible authority* of the *Church:* That he doth ſuppoſe it to be *Gods Word*, when he ſaith, It is a *Light to his feet*, I deny not; but that he ſhould ſuppoſe it to be ſo, becauſe the *Church* did infallibly tell him it was ſo, is a moſt ungrounded Aſſertion. Had he not ſufficient evidence that the *Law* was from *God*, by thoſe many unqueſtionable and ſtupendous *Miracles*, which attended the delivery of it? Was not the whole conſtitution and government of the *Jewiſh Nation*, an impregnable argument that thoſe things were true, which were recorded in their Books? Did ever the *Jewiſh Sanhedrin*, *High Prieſt*, or others, arrogate to themſelves any infallible Teſtimony, in delivering the Books of *Moſes* to the people? The moſt you can ſuppoſe of a ground of certainty among them, was from that *Sacred Record* of the *Book* of the *Law*, which was kept in the *Ark:* And how could they know that was *Authentick*, but from the ſame *Tradition*, which conveyed the *Miracles* of *Moſes* to them? So that nothing like any infallible Authority of a *Church* was looked on by them as neceſſary to believe the Law to have been from God. 3. Suppoſing it from tradition unqueſtionable, that the *Law* was from *God*, thoſe incomparable directions which were in it might be a great confirmation to *David*'s *Faith*, that it was his Word. Which is that he intends, in theſe words, *Thy Word is a light to my feet*, &c. to ſhew that excellency and perſpicuity which was in his *Word*, that it gave him the beſt directions for ordering his converſation. And this is all which his Lordſhip means, that to thoſe, who, by the advantage of Tradition, have already venerable thoughts of *Scripture*; the ſerious converſing with it, doth highly advance them, and eſtabliſh their belief of it, as *that Faith* is thereby *clinched* which was *driven in* by education. And therefore, when he ſaith, *That Light diſcovers its ſelf as well as other things*, he preſently adds, *not till there hath been a preparing inſtruction what Light it is. Thus*, (he ſaith) *the Tradition of the Church is the firſt moral motive to belief: But the belief it ſelf, that Scripture is the Word of God, reſts upon Scripture, when a man finds it to anſwer and exceed that which the Church gave in Teſtimony.* P. 84. For this his Lordſhip cites *Origen*, who, though much nearer the prime *Tradition* than we are, yet being to prove that the Scriptures were inſpired from God, he ſaith, *De hoc aſſignabimus ex ipſis Scripturis Divinis, quæ nos competenter moverint, &c. We will mention thoſe things out of the ſacred Scriptures, which have perſvaded us*, &c. Orig. περὶ ἀρχῶν l. 4 c. 1. To this you anſwer, *Though* Origen *prove by the Scriptures themſelves, that they were inſpired from God; yet doth he never avow, that this could be proved out of them, unleſs they were received by the infallible Authority of the Church.* P. 83. Which Anſwer is very unreaſonable. For, 1. It might be juſtly expected that when his *Lordſhip* had produced an expreſs Teſtimony to his purpoſe out of *Origen*, you ſhould have brought ſome other as clear for his believing *Scripture* on the *Churches Infallibility*, which you are ſo far from, that you would put us to prove a *Negative:* But, if you will deal fairly, and as you ought to do, produce your Teſtimonies out of him, and the reſt of the Fathers concerning your Churches Infallibility. Till then, excuſe us if we take their expreſs words, and leave you to gather *Infallibility* out of their latent meanings. 2. What doth your Infallibility conduce to believing *Scriptures* for *themſelves?* For, you ſay, *The Scriptures cannot be proved by themſelves to*

be Gods Word, unleſs they were received by the infallible Authority of the Church; it ſeems then, if they be ſo received, they may be proved by themſelves to be *God's Word*. Are thoſe proofs by *themſelves* ſufficient for *Faith* or no? If not, they are very ſlender proofs: if they be, what need your *Churches Infallibility?* Unleſs you will ſuppoſe, no man can diſcern thoſe proofs without your *Churches Teſtimony*; and then they are not *proofs* by *themſelves*, but from your Churches Infallibility; which may ſerve for one acceſſion more to the *heap* of your *Contradictions*. His Lordſhip aſſerting the *laſt reſolution of Faith* to be into ſimply Divine Authority, cites that ſpeech of *Henr. à Gandavo, That in the Primitive Church, when the Apoſtles themſelves ſpake, they did believe principally for the ſake of God, and not the Apoſtles*; from whence he infers, *If, where the Apoſtles themſelves ſpake, the laſt reſolution of Faith was into God, and not into themſelves on their own account; much more ſhall it now be into God, and not the preſent Church, and into the writings of the Apoſtles, than into the words of their ſucceſſors made up into Tradition.* All that you anſwer, is, *That this argument*
Ibid. *muſt be ſolved by the Biſhop, as well as you, becauſe he hath granted the authority of the Apoſtles was Divine as well as you.* Was there ever a more ſenſeleſs Anſwer! Doth *Gandavo* deny the *Apoſtles authority* to have been *Divine?* Nay, Doth he not imply it, when he ſaith, Men did not believe for the *Apoſtles ſakes*, but for *God's*, who ſpake by them. As S. *Paul* ſaid, *You received our word, not as the word of men, but as it is indeed the Word of God.* How *the Biſhop ſhould be concerned to anſwer this*, is beyond my skill to imagine. If *Origen ſpeaks to ſuch as believed the Scriptures to be the Word of God*; ſo doth the *Biſhop* too, *viz.* on the account of Tradition and Education. If *Origen* endeavoured by thoſe proofs to confirm and ſettle their Faith, that is all the *Biſhop* aims at, that a Faith taken up on the Churches Tradition, may be ſetled and confirmed by the internal arguments of Scripture. But, how you ſhould from this diſcourſe aſſert, *That the Authority of the Church muſt be infallible in delivering the Scripture*, is again beyond my reach, neither can I poſſibly think what ſhould bear the face of *Premiſes* to ſuch a *Concluſion*. Unleſs it be, if *Origen* aſſert, *That the Scriptures may be believed for themſelves, if* Gandavo *ſaith, That the reſolution of Faith muſt be into God himſelf*, then the *Churches Authority* muſt be *infallible*; but it appears already, that the premiſes are true, and what then remains but *therefore, &c.* which may indeed be liſted among your rare argumentations for *Infallibility*.

§. 13. 2. *That Scripture cannot manifeſt it ſelf to be an infallible Light*; the proof of which is the deſign of your following diſcourſe. Wherein you firſt quarrel *with the Biſhop for his arguing from the Scriptures being a Light; for thence* (you ſay) *it will only follow, that the Scripture manifeſts it ſelf to be a Light, which you grant, but that it ſhould manifeſt it ſelf to be an infallible*
P. 82, 89. *Light you deny; for* (ſay you) *unleſs he could ſhew that there are no other Lights, ſave the Word of* God, *and ſuch as are infallible: he can never make good his conſequence. For in* Seneca, Plutarch, Ariſtotle, *you read many Lights, and thoſe manifeſt themſelves to be Lights; but they do not therefore manifeſt themſelves to be infallible Lights.* The ſubſtance of your argument lyes in this, *The Scripture diſcovers the Being of God; ſo doth the Talmud and Alcoran, as well as it; the Scripture delivers abundance of moral inſtructions, but theſe may be found in multitudes of other Books, both of Chriſtians, and Jews, and Heathens; and as we do not thence infer, that theſe Books are infallible, ſo neither can we that the Scriptures are.* This is the utmoſt of ſenſe or reaſon, which I can extract out of your diſcourſe; which reduced into *Form*, will come to this. If the *Scriptures* contain nothing in them, but what may be found in other *Books* that are not *infallible*, then the

Scriptures

Scriptures cannot ſhew themſelves to be *infallible*; but the antecedent is true, and therefore the conſequent. I could wiſh you would have taken a little more pains in proving that which muſt be your aſſumption, *viz. That Scripture contains nothing in it but what may be ſeen in* Seneca, Plutarch, Ariſtotle, *the* Talmud, Alcoran, *and other Books of Jews and Heathens.* Theſe are rare things to aſſert among *Chriſtians*, without offering at any more proof of them than you do, which lyes in this *Syllogiſm. If Scripture contain ſome things* which may be ſeen in theſe *Books*, then it contains *nothing* but what may be ſeen in theſe *Books*; but the *Scripture* contains ſome things which may be ſeen in other Books, *viz. the exiſtence of God*, and *moral inſtructions*; therefore it contains nothing but what is in them. And, Do you really think that you have now proved, that there is nothing in *Scripture* that can ſhew it ſelf to be *infallible*, becauſe ſome things are common to other writings. Would you not take it very ill that any ſhould ſay that you had no more *brains* than a *Horſe*, or a creature of a like nature, becauſe they have *ſenſe* and *motion*, as well as you? Yet this is the very ſame argument whereby you would prove that the *Scriptures* cannot ſhew themſelves to be *Divine*, becauſe the *Talmud*, *Alcoran*, and *Philoſophers*, have ſome things in them which the *Scripture* hath. But, Can you prove that the *Scripture* hath nothing elſe in it, but what may be found in any, or all of theſe Books? Will you undertake to ſhew any where ſuch *repreſentations* of the *Being* and *Attributes of God*, ſo ſuitable to the conceptions which naturally flow from the *Idea* of a *Supreme* and *Infinite Being*, and yet thoſe *Attributes* diſcovered in ſuch contrivances for mans *Good*, which the wit of man could never have reached to; above all, in the *reconciliation* of the world to himſelf by the death of his *Son?* Will you find out ſo exact a *Rule* of Piety, conſiſting of ſuch *excellent Precepts*, ſuch *incouraging Promiſes* as are in *Scripture*, in any other writings whatſoever? Can you diſcover any where ſuch an unexpreſſible *energy* and force in a writing of ſo great *ſimplicity* and *plainneſs* as the *Scripture* is? Is there any thing unbecoming that *Authority*, which it awes the Conſciences of men with? Is there any thing mean, trivial, fabulous, and impertinent in it? Are not all things written with that infinite *decorum* and ſuitableneſs, as do highly expreſs the *Majeſty* of him from whom it comes, but in the moſt ſweet, affable, and condeſcending manner? Are there are any ſuch arguments in the writings of *Seneca*, *Plutarch*, *Ariſtotle*, for the Being of *God*, and *Immortality* of *ſouls*, as there are in *Scripture?* Are there any *moral inſtructions* built on ſuch *good grounds*, carried on to ſo high a *degree*, written with that *life* and *vigour* in any of the *Heathen Philoſophers*, as are in the *Scriptures?* How infinitely do the higheſt of them fall ſhort of the *Scripture* in thoſe very things, which they ſeem moſt to have in common with it? As, were it here a fit place, might be at large diſcovered. But, beſides, and beyond all theſe, Are there not other *things* which evidence the *Divine Revelation* of the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture*, which none of the *writings* you mention, can in the leaſt pretend to, *viz.* the accurate *accompliſhment* of *Prophecies*, and the abundance of *Miracles* wrought for the confirmation of the *Divine Teſtimony* of thoſe who delivered this *Doctrine* to the world. And theſe very things now to us are *internal* to the *Scripture*, the *motives* of *Faith* being delivered to us in the ſame Books that the *Doctrine* of *Faith* is: In which ſenſe the *Scriptures* may well be ſaid to be proved *Divine* by *themſelves*, and that they appear *infallible* by the *Light* which is in them, notwithſtanding you moſt pitifully pretend to the contrary. And, if your *Church* will again pardon you for ſuch opprobrious language of Scripture, as not only to compare the writings of *Seneca*, *Plutarch*, and *Ariſtotle* with it, which yet are commendable in their kind,

for

for *moral Virtue*, and *natural Knowledge*; but thoſe wretched and notorious impoſtures of the *Alcoran*, and the fabulous relations of the *Talmud*; if, I ſay, your *Church* will pardon ſuch expreſſions as theſe, becauſe they tend to inhance her *Infallibility*, well fare that *Pope*, who ſaid *Heu quam minimo regitur mundus!*

As for your following inſtance *of a Candle lighted in a room, which ſhews that it is a light, but not who lighted it; ſo the ſentences in Scripture are lights, and ſhew themſelves to be ſuch, but they cannot ſhew themſelves to be ſuch infallible lights which are produced by none but God himſelf:* I anſwer; That I commend your diſcretion in making choice of a *Candle* rather than of the *light of the Sun* to ſet forth the *Scripture* by. For a *Candle* yields but a dim uncertain light, may be put into a *dark Lanthorn*, and *ſnuffed* at pleaſure; ſo would your *Church* fain pretend of the *Scripture*, that its *light* is very *weak* and *uncertain*, that your *Church* muſt open the ſides of the *Lanthorn* that it may give light, and make uſe of ſome *Apoſtolical Snuffers* of the *Popes* keeping, to make it ſhine the *clearer*, though they often endanger the almoſt extinguiſhing of it; at leaſt as to the generality of thoſe who ſhould enjoy the benefit of it. But becauſe that poor *light* of a *Candle* cannot ſhew who lighted it, Will not the *light* of the *Sun* manifeſt it ſelf to be no greater than that of a *Candle?* Cannot any one infer from the *vaſt extent* of that *light*, from the vaniſhing of it upon the *Suns* ſetting, and its diſperſing it ſelf at his *riſing*, that this *light* can proceed only from that great *luminous body* which is in the *Heavens?* And may we not proportionably infer, from the *clearneſs*, *greatneſs*, *majeſty*, *coherency* of thoſe *truths* revealed in *Scripture*, that they muſt certainly come from none but *God*; eſpecially being joyned with thoſe impregnable *evidences* which himſelf by the perſons who delivered them hath given that they were imployed by himſelf for that end? But becauſe this is a matter of great conſequence give me leave to propound theſe queſtions to you, and after you have conſidered them ſeriouſly, return me a rational anſwer to them. 1. Doth it imply any repugnancy at all in the *nature* of the *thing*, or to the *nature* of *God*, that he ſhould reval his mind to the world. 2. If it doth not, as I ſuppoſe you will grant that, Whether is it poſſible that *God* ſhould make it evident to the world that ſuch a *Revelation* is from himſelf? 3. If this be not impoſſible, Is it not neceſſary that it ſhould be ſo, ſuppoſing that *God* ſhould require the *belief* of a Doctrine ſo revealed on *pain* of *eternal damnation* for not believing it? 4. Whether *God* may not give as great evidence of a *Revelation* that he makes of his mind to the world, as he doth of his *Being*, from the *Wiſdom*, *Goodneſs* and *Power*, which may be ſeen in the *works* of *Creation?* 5. Whether any other way be conceivable that it ſhould be evident that a *Doctrine* comes from *God*, but that it contains things highly ſuitable to the *Divine Nature*, things above the *finding* out of *humane reaſon*, things only tending to advance *Holineſs* and *Goodneſs* in the world, and this doctrine to be delivered by perſons who wrought unparallel'd *miracles?* 6. Whether all theſe be not in the moſt evident manner imaginable contained in the *Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity*, and in the *Books* of *Scripture?* which I leave any man that hath common ſenſe to judge of? 7. Whether then it be not the higheſt diſparagement of this *Divine doctrine* to make it ſtand in need of an Infallible teſtimony of any company who ſhall take the boldneſs to call themſelves the *Catholick Church*, in order to the believing of it; and whether there can be any greater diſhonour done it, than to ſay it hath no more light to diſcover it ſelf Divine, than the *Writings of Philoſophers*, not to add of *Jews* and *Mahumetans?* Theſe things I leave you and the Reader to conſider of, and proceed. What follows *concerning the Fathers and others proving the Scriptures*

to

to be the Word of God by themſelves, after they have believed them infallibly on other grounds, is, *gratis dictum*, unleſs you can prove from the *Fathers*, that they did believe the *Scriptures infallibly* on other grounds. Which when you ſhall think fit to attempt I make no queſtion to anſwer, but in the mean time to a crude aſſertion it is enough to oppoſe a bare denial. Your following abſurdities concerning the *private Spirit, infallible aſſurance, Apoſtolical Tradition*, have been frequently examined already. Only what you ſay, *that you read, eſteem, nay very highly reverence the Scripture*; is but *Proteſtatio contra factum*, as may appear by your former expreſſions, and therefore can have no force at all with wiſe men, who judge by *things* and not by *bare words*. P. 90.

3. You ſay, *That if there were ſuch ſufficient light in Scripture to ſhew it ſelf, you ſhould ſee it as well as we; ſeeing you read it as diligently, and eſteem it as highly as we do.* What! *You* eſteem the *Scripture* as highly as we, who ſay, that the *Scripture appears no more of it ſelf to be Gods Word, than diſtinction of colours to a blind man! You*, who but in the page before had ſaid, there was *no more light in Scripture to diſcover it ſelf, than in* Seneca, Plutarch, Ariſtotle, *nay as to ſome things than the Talmud and Alcoran! You*, who ſay that, notwithſtanding the *Scriptures, Chriſt would have been eſteemed an Ignoramus and Impoſtor, if your Church be not Infallible!* Are you the man, who *eſteem as highly of the Scriptures* as we do? May we not therefore juſtly return you your own language; and ſay, *that if you do not ſee this light in Scripture, it is becauſe your eyes are perverſe, your underſtanding unſanctified*, which inſtead of diſcovering ſuch Divine light in Scripture as to make you love and adore it, can have the confidence to utter ſuch expreſſions which tend ſo highly to the diſparagement of it. §. 14. Ibid. n. 7.

But did not his Lordſhip give before a ſufficient anſwer to this objection, by ſaying, 1. *That the light is ſufficient in it ſelf, but it doth not follow that it muſt be evident to every one that looks into it; for the blindneſs or perverſneſs of mens minds may keep them from the diſcovery of it.* 2. He ſaith, *This light is not ſo full a light as that of the firſt Principles, as, that the whole is greater than the part, that the ſame thing cannot be, and not be, at the ſame time.* And yet ſuch is your ſincerity, you would ſeem at firſt to perſwade the Reader of the contrary in your next *Paragraph*; but at laſt you grant that he denies it to be *evidently known as one of the Principles of the firſt ſort.* (For you with your wonted ſubtilty diſtinguiſh *Principles known of themſelves, into ſuch as are either evidently, and ſuch as are probably known of themſelves*, i. e. *Principles known of themſelves*, are either ſuch as *are known of themſelves*, or ſuch *as are not*; for what is but *probably known*, is not certainly *known of it ſelf*, but by that *probable argument* which cauſeth aſſent to it). But when you deny *that the Scripture is ſo much as one of the ſecond ſort of principles*, and ſay expreſly, *That of it ſelf it appears not ſo much as probably to be more the Word of God, than ſome other Book that is not truly ſuch*; were you not ſo uſed to Contradictions, I would deſire you to reconcile this expreſſion, with what you ſaid a little before of your high Eſteem and Reverence of the *Scriptures*. P. 85.

3. *The Biſhop ſaith, That when he ſpeaks of this light in Scripture, he only means it of ſuch a light as is of force to breed Faith, that it is the Word of God; not to make a perfect knowledge. Now Faith, of whatſoever it is, this or other principle, is an evidence, as well as knowledge; and the belief is firmer than any knowledge can be, becauſe it reſts upon Divine authority, which cannot deceive; whereas knowledge (or at leaſt he that thinks he knows) is not ever certain in deductions from Principles; but the Evidence is not ſo clear. Now God doth not require a full demonſtrative knowledge in us that the Scripture is his Word, and therefore in his Providence hath kindled in it no light*

for

for that, but he requires our Faith of it, and ſuch a certain demonſtration as may fit that. Now what anſwer do you return to all this? *Why*, forſooth, *We muſt have certainty, nay an Infallible certainty, nay ſuch an Infallible certainty as is built on the Infallible Authority of the Church*, yet ſuch an *Infallible Authority* as can be proved only by *motives of credibility*; which is a new kind of *Climax* in *Rhetorick*, viz. a *ladder* ſtanding with both *ends* upon *ground* at the ſame time. All the anſwer I ſhall therefore now give it, is, that your *Faith* then is *certain, Infallibly certain*, and yet built on but *probable motives*, and therefore on your own *Principles* muſt be alſo *uncertain*, very *uncertain*, nay *undoubtedly* and *Infallibly uncertain*. What again follows concerning *Canonical Books* and the *private Spirit*, I muſt ſend them, as *Conſtables* do *vagrants*, to the place from whence they came, and there they ſhall meet with a ſufficient *Anſwer*.

§. 15. The remainder of this Chapter conſiſts of a tedious vindication of *Bellarmine* and *Brierely*, which being of little conſequence to the main buſineſs, I ſhall return the ſhorter anſwer. I ſhall not quarrel much with you about the interpretation of thoſe words of *Bellarmine* in the ſenſe you give them, *viz.* if they be underſtood of *abſolute neceſſity, not of all Chriſtians*, and *only in rare caſes*, that it is not neceſſary to believe that there is Scripture, on ſuppoſition that the *Doctrine* of *Scripture* could be ſufficiently conveyed to the minds of any without it, as in the caſe of the *Barbarous Nations* mentioned by *Irenæus*. But for you who make the tradition of the preſent *Church Infallible*, and at the leaſt the *Infallible conveyer* of the *formal object of Faith*; I do not ſee how you can avoid making it as *abſolutely neceſſary* to be believed as any other *object* of Faith: unleſs your *Church* hath ſome other way of conveying objects of Faith, than by propounding the *Scripture* infallibly to us. If therefore men are bound to believe things abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, becauſe contained in that *Book*, which the *Church* delivers to be the *Infallible Word of God*; I cannot poſſibly ſee, but the belief of the *Scripture* on the Churches Infallible Teſtimony muſt be as neceſſary *neceſſitate medii* as any thing contained in it. As for the Citation of *Hooker* by *Brierely*, Whether it be falſified or no will beſt be ſeen by producing the ſcope and deſign of that worthy *Author* in the Teſtimonies cited out of him. Upon an impartial view of which in the ſeveral places referred to, I cannot but ſay, that if *Brierely*'s deſign was to ſhew that *Hooker* made the authority of the *Church* that into which *Faith* is laſtly reſolved, he doth evidently contradict Mr. *Hookers* deſign, and is therefore guilty of unfaithful repreſenting his meaning. For where he doth moſt fully and largely expreſs himſelf he uſeth theſe words, which for clearing his meaning muſt be fully produced. *Scripture teacheth all ſupernaturally revealed truth, without the knowledge whereof ſalvation cannot be attained. The main principle whereon the belief of all things therein contained dependeth, is, that the Scriptures are the Oracles of God himſelf. This in it ſelf we cannot ſay is evident. For then all men that hear it would acknowledge it in heart, as they do when they hear that every whole is more than any part of that whole, becauſe this in it ſelf is evident. The other we know that all do not acknowledge it when they hear it. There muſt be therefore ſome former knowledge preſuppoſed, which doth herein aſſure the hearts of all believers. Scripture teacheth us that ſaving truth which God hath diſcovered to the world by Revelation, and it preſumeth us taught otherwiſe, that it ſelf is Divine and Sacred. The queſtion then being by what means we are taught this; ſome anſwer, That to learn it we have no other way than only Tradition: As namely that ſo we believe, becauſe both we from our predeceſſors, and they from theirs have ſo received. But is this enough? That which all mens experience teacheth them, may not*

P. 91, &c. n. 8, 9.

De Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 14.

l. 3. ſect. 8.

in

in any wise be denyed. And by experience we all know, that the first Motive leading men so to esteem of the Scripture, is the Authority of Gods Church. For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it even at the first an impudent thing for any man bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary mind without cause. Afterwards the more we bestow our labour in reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing it self doth answer our receiv'd opinion concerning it. So that the former inducement prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministred farther reason. Can any thing be more plain (if mens meaning may be gathered from their words, especially when purposely they treat of a subject) than that *Hooker* makes the *Authority* of the *Church* the primary inducement to *Faith*, and that *rational evidence*, which discovers it self in the *Doctrine* revealed to be that which it is finally resolved into? For, as his Lordship saith on this very place of *Hooker*, *The resolution of Faith ever settles upon the fartheſt reason it can, not upon the first inducement.* By this place then where this *worthy Author* most clearly and fully delivers his judgement, we ought in reason to interpret all other occasional and incidental passages on the same subject. So in that other place, *For whatsoever we believe concerning salvation by Christ although the Scripture be therein the ground of our belief, yet the authority of man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scriptures.* I will not dispute, whether here he speaks concerning the knowledge of *Scripture* to be *Scripture*, or concerning the natural sense and meaning of *Scripture*: suppose I should grant you the latter, it would make little for your purpose; for when he adds, *The Scripture doth not teach us the things that are of God, unless we did credit men who have taught us that the words of Scripture do signifie those things.* You need not here *bid us stay a while*: For his sense is plain and obvious, *viz.* that men cannot come to the natural sense and importance of the words used in *Scripture*, unless they rely on the *authority of men* for the *signification* of those *words*. He speaks not here then at all concerning *Church-Tradition* properly taken, but meerly of the *authority of man*, which he contends must in many cases be relyed on, particularly in that of the sense and meaning of the *words* which occurr in *Scripture*. Therefore with his Lordships leave and yours too, I do not think that in this place *Hooker* by the *authority of man* doth understand *Church-Tradition*, but if I may so call it *Humane-Tradition*, *viz.* that which acquainteth us with the force and signification of *words* in *use*. When therefore you prove, that it is *Tradition* only, which is all the ground he puts of believing *Scripture* to be the *Word of God*, from those words of his, *That utterly to infringe the force and strength of mans testimony, were to shake the very Fortress of Gods truth. Now* (say you) *How can that Fortress* (*the Scripture*) *be shaken, were not that authority esteemed by him the ground of that Fortress?* That may very easily be shewn, *viz.* by calling in question the *truth of humane testimony* in general; for he plainly speaks of such a kind of *humane testimony* as that is, whereby we know there is such a City as *Rome*, that such and such were *Popes* of *Rome*, wherein the ground of our perswasion can be nothing else but *humane testimony*; now take away the *credit* and *validity* of this *testimony*, the *very Fortress of truth* must needs be shaken; for we could never be certain that there were such persons, as *Moses*, the *Prophets*, *Christ* and his *Apostles* in the world, we could never be certain of the meaning of any thing written by them. But how far is this from the final resolution of Faith into *Church-Tradition?* But the place you lay the greatest force on, is that which you *first* cite out of him, *Finally we all believe that the Scriptures of God are sacred, and that they have proceeded from*

P. 90.

L. 2. sect. 7.

L. 2. sect. 4.

God; our ſelves we aſſure, that we do right well in ſo believing. We have for this a demonſtration ſound and Infallible. But it is not the Word of God which doth or can poſſibly aſſure us, that we do well to think it his Word. From hence you infer, *That either he muſt ſettle no Infallible ground at all, or muſt ſay that the Tradition of the Church is that ground.* No *Infallible ground* in *your ſenſe*, I grant it, but well enough in his own; for all the difficulty lies in underſtanding what he means by *Infallible*; which he takes not in your ſenſe for a *ſupernatural*, but only for a *rational Infallibility*; not ſuch a one as excludes *poſſibility of deception*, but all *reaſonable doubting*. In which ſenſe he ſaith of ſuch things as are capable only of moral certainty, L. 2. ſect. 8. *That the Teſtimony of man will ſtand as a ground of Infallible aſſurance*; and preſently inſtanceth in theſe, *That there is ſuch a City of* Rome, *that* Pius V. *was Pope there*, &c. So afterwards he ſaith, *That the mind of man deſireth evermore to know the truth according to the moſt Infallible certainty which the nature of things can yield*: by which it is plain, that the *utmoſt certainty* which things are capable of, is with him *Infallible certainty*; and ſo a ſound and *Infallible ground* of Faith is a *certain ground*, which we all aſſert may be had without your Churches *Infallible Teſtimony*. Whether therefore *Briefly* and you are not guilty, if not of falſifying *Hooker*'s words, yet of perverting his meaning, let the *Impartial Reader* judge.

CHAP. VII.

The Churches Infallibility not proved from Scripture.

Some general conſiderations from the deſign of proving the Churches Infallibility from Scripture. No Infallibility in the High-Prieſt and his Clergy under the Law; if there had been, no neceſſity there ſhould be under the Goſpel. Of St. Baſil's *Teſtimony concerning Traditions. Scripture leſs lyable to corruption than Traditions. The great uncertainty of judging Traditions when Apoſtolical, when not. The Churches perpetuity being promiſed in Scripture proves not its Infallibility. His Lordſhip doth not falſifie* A. C's *words, but* T. C. *doth his meaning. Producing the Jeſuits words no traducing their Order.* T. C.'s *miſerable Apology for them. The particular Texts produced for the Churches Infallibility, examined. No ſuch Infallibility neceſſary in the Apoſtles Succeſſors as in Themſelves. The ſimilitude of Scripture and Tradition to an Ambaſſadour and his Credentials, rightly ſtated.*

§. 1. THE main deſign of this Chapter being to prove the *Infallibility* of the *Church* from the *Teſtimonies* of *Scripture*; before I come to a particular diſcuſſion of the matters contained in it, I ſhall make ſome general *Obſervations* on the ſcope and deſign of it, which may give more light to the particulars to be handled in it. 1. *That the Infallibility you challenge to the Church, is ſuch as muſt ſuppoſe a promiſe extant of it in Scripture*: Which is evident from the words of *A. C.* (which you own) to his Lordſhip, *That if he would conſider the Tradition of the Church, not only as it is the Tradition of a company of fallible men, in which ſenſe the Authority of it is humane and fallible, but as the Tradition of a company of men aſſiſted by Chriſt and his Holy Spirit; in that ſenſe he might eaſily find it more than an Introduction, indeed as much as would amount to an Infallible Motive.* Whence I inferr, that in order to the *Churches Teſtimony* being an *Infallible Motive* to *Faith*, it muſt be believed that this *company of men* which make the *Church*, are *aſſiſted by Chriſt* and his *Holy Spirit*; Now I demand,

Suppoſing

Suppoſing there were no *Scripture* extant, (the belief of which you ſaid before in defence of *Bellarmine*, was not neceſſary to ſalvation) by what means could you prove ſuch an Infallible *Aſſiſtance* of the *Holy Spirit* in the *Catholick Church* in order to the perſwading an *Infidel* to believe? Could you to one that neither believes *Chriſt*, nor the *Holy Ghoſt*, prove evidently that your *Church* had an aſſiſtance of both theſe? You tell him that he cannot believe that there is a *Chriſt* or a *Holy Ghoſt* unleſs he believes firſt your *Church* to be *Infallible*, and yet he cannot believe your *Church* to be *Infallible*, unleſs he believes there are ſuch things as *Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*; for that Infallibility, by your own confeſſion, doth ſuppoſe the peculiar *aſſiſtance* of both theſe. And can any one believe their *aſſiſtance*, before he believes they are? If you ſay, as you do, *By the motives of credibility you will prove your Church Infallible* (ſetting aſide the abſurdity of that which I have fully diſcovered already) Is it poſſible for you to prove your *Church Infallible*, unleſs antecedently to the belief of your *Churches Infallibility*, you can prove to an *Infidel* the truth of theſe things?

1. That the *names of Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*, are no *Chimerical Fancies and Ideas*, but that they do import *ſomething real*: otherwiſe an *Infidel* would ſpeedily tell you, theſe *names* imported nothing but ſome kind of *Magical ſpells* which could keep men from *errour*, as long as they carried them about with them. That as well might *Mahomet*, or any other *Impoſtor*, pretend an *infallible Aſſiſtance* from ſome *Tutelar Angels*, with hard *Arabick names*, as you of *Chriſt*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*, unleſs you can make it appear to him, that really there are ſuch *Beings* as *Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*; and when you have proved it to him, and he be upon your proof inclinable to believe it, you are bound to tell him by your *Doctrine*, that for all theſe *proofs*, he can only *fancy* there are ſuch *Beings*, but he cannot really *believe* them, unleſs he firſt believes your *Church infallible*. And when he tells you, *He cannot, according to your own Doctrine, believe that Infallibility, unleſs he believes the other firſt*, Would he not cry out upon you, as either lamentable *Fools*, that did not underſtand what you ſaid, or egregious *Impoſtors*, that play faſt and looſe with him, bidding him believe firſt one thing, and then another, till at laſt he may juſtly tell you, that in this manner he cannot be perſwaded to believe any thing at all? 2. Suppoſing he ſhould get through this, and believe that there were ſuch *Beings* as *Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*, he may juſtly ask you, 1. Whether they be nothing elſe but ſuch a kind of *Intellectus Agens*, as the *Arabick Philoſophers* imagined, ſome kind of *Being* which did aſſiſt the underſtanding in conception? You anſwer him *No*, but they are *real diſtinct perſonalities* of the ſame *nature* and *eſſence* with *God* himſelf; then he asks, 2. Whence doth this appear? for theſe being ſuch grand *difficulties*, you had need of ſome very clear evidence of them: If you ſend him to *Scripture*, he asks you, To what end? for the belief of that muſt ſuppoſe the *Truth* of the *thing* in *Queſtion*, that your *Church is infallible* in delivery of this *Scripture* for *Divine Revelation*. But he further demands, 3. Whence comes that *Church* which you call *Infallible* to have this *Aſſiſtance* of both theſe? Do they aſſiſt all kind of men to make them *infallible*? You anſwer, *No*. But, Do they aſſiſt, though not all men ſeparately, yet all ſocieties of men conjunctly? You anſwer, *No*. Do they aſſiſt all men only in *Religious actions*, of what Religion ſoever they are? Still you anſwer, *No*. Do they aſſiſt then all men of the *Chriſtian Religion* in their ſocieties? *No*. Do they aſſiſt all thoſe among the *Chriſtians*, who ſay, they have this *Aſſiſtance*? *No*. Do they thus aſſiſt all *Churches* to keep them from errour? *No*. *Whom* is it then that they do thus infallibly aſſiſt? You anſwer, The *Church*. But what *Church* do you mean? *The Catholick Church*. But, which is this *Catholick Church* (for, I hear, there are as great Contro-

verſies about that, as any thing.) You muſt anſwer confidently, *That Church which is in the* Roman *Communion, is the true Catholick Church.* Have then all in that *Communion* this *Infallible Aſſiſtance? No.* Have all the *Biſhops* in this Communion, it? *No.* Have all theſe *Biſhops* this *Aſſiſtance*, when met together? *Yes*, ſay you, *undoubtedly, if the Pope be their Head, and confirm their Acts.* Then it ſhould ſeem to me, that this *Infallible Aſſiſtance* is in the *Pope*, and he it is whom you call the *Catholick Church*: But ſurely he is a *very big man* then, is he not? But, ſay you, *Theſe are Controverſies which are not neceſſary for you to know, it ſufficeth that the Catholick Church is the ſubject of Infallibility.* But, I had thought nothing could have been more neceſſary than to *have known this*: But I proceed then, How comes this *Catholick Church* to have this *Infallible Aſſiſtance?* Cannot I ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* and the *Holy Spirit* may exiſt without giving this *Aſſiſtance?* cannot I ſuppoſe that *Chriſtian Religion* may be in the world, without ſuch an *Infallibility?* Is this *Aſſiſtance* therefore a *neceſſary*, or a *free* Act? A *free Act.* If a *free Act*, then, for all you know, Your *Catholick Church* may not be ſo aſſiſted: *No*, (you reply) *you are ſure it is ſo aſſiſted.* But, Whence can you be *ſure* of an *arbitrary thing*, unleſs the *Authors* of this *Aſſiſtance* have engaged themſelves by *Promiſe*, to give your *Catholick Church that Infallible Aſſiſtance? Yes*, that they have (you reply) and then produce *Luk.* 10. 16. *Mat.* 28. 20. *Joh.* 14. 16. But, although our *Infidel* might ask ſome untoward Queſtions ſtill; as, How you are ſure theſe are *Divine Promiſes*, when the knowledge that they are *Divine* muſt ſuppoſe the thing to be *true*, which you would prove out of them, *viz.* that your *Church is infallible?* Suppoſing them *Divine*, how are you *ſure*, That, and no other, is the *meaning* of them, when from ſuch places you prove, that your *Church* is the only *Infallible Interpreter* of *Scripture?* But, I let paſs theſe, and other Queſtions, and ſatisfie my ſelf with this, *That it is impoſſible for you to prove ſuch an Infallible Aſſiſtance of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, unleſs you produce ſome expreſs Promiſe for it.*

2. This being impoſſible, it neceſſarily follows, *That the only Motives of Credibility, which can prove your Church Infallible, muſt be ſuch as do antecedently prove theſe Promiſes to be Divine.* This is ſo plain and evident a *Conſectary* from the former, that it were an *affront* upon humane underſtanding, to go about to prove it: For, if the *Infallibility* doth depend upon the *Promiſe*, nothing can prove that *Infallibility*, but what doth prove that *Promiſe* to be *True* and *Divine*: *True*, or elſe not to be believed; *Divine*, or elſe not to be relyed on for ſuch an *Aſſiſtance*; none elſe being able to make a promiſe of it, but the Author of it. As therefore my right to an eſtate as given by *Will*, depends wholly upon the *Truth* and *Validity* of that *Will*, which I muſt firſt prove, before I can challenge any *right* to it; So your preſence of *Infallibility* muſt ſolely depend upon the *Promiſes* which you challenge it by. By which it appears, that your attempting to prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, by *Motives* of *Credibility*, antecedent to, and independent on the *Scripture*, is vain, ridiculous, and deſtructive to that very *Infallibility* which you pretend to. Which, being by a *free Aſſiſtance* of *Chriſt* and his *Spirit*, muſt wholly depend on the proof of the *Promiſe* made of it. For, if you prove no *Promiſe*, all your *Motives of Credibility* prove nothing at all, as I have at large demonſtrated before, and ſhall not follow you in needleſs repetitions.

3. *No right to any priviledge can be challenged, by virtue of a free Promiſe made to particular perſons, unleſs it be evident that the intention of the Promiſer was, that it ſhould equally extend to them and others.* For the *Promiſe* being *free*, and the *Priviledge* ſuch as carries no neceſſity at all along with it, in order to the great ends of Chriſtian Religion; it is intolerable *Arrogance* and *Preſumption* to challenge it, without manifeſt evidence, that the deſign

ſign of it was for *them*, as well as the *perſons* to whom it was made. Indeed, in ſuch *Promiſes* which are built on common and general *grounds*, containing things agreeable to all *Chriſtians*, it is but reaſonable to infer the univerſal *extent* of that *Promiſe* to all ſuch as are in the like condition. Hence the *Apoſtle* infers, from the particular Promiſe made to *Joſhua*, *I will never leave thee, nor forſake thee*; the effect of it upon all believers: Although, had not the *Apoſtle* done it before us, it may ſeem queſtionable on what ground we could have done it, unleſs from the general *reaſon* of it, and the unbounded nature of *Divine Goodneſs*, in things neceſſary for the *Good* of his *People*. But in things *arbitrary*, and ſuch as contain *ſpecial Priviledge* in them, to challenge a *right* to a Promiſe of the ſame Priviledge, without equal *evidence* of the deſcent of it, as the firſt *Grant*, is great preſumption, and a challenge of the *Promiſor* for *partiality*, if he doth not make it good. Becauſe the pretence of the right of the *Priviledge* goes upon this ground, that it is as much due to the *Succeſſor*, as to the Original *Grantee*.

4. *Nothing can be more unreaſonable, than to challenge a right to a Priviledge, by virtue of ſuch a Promiſe which was granted upon quite different conſiderations from the grounds on which that right is challenged.* Thus I ſhall after make it evident, that the Promiſe of an *Infallible Aſſiſtance* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, had a peculiar reſpect to the *Apoſtles* preſent employment, and the firſt *ſtate* of the *Church*, that it was not made upon *reaſons* common to all ages, *viz.* for the *Government of the Church*, *deciding Controverſies*, *Foundation of Faith*, all which Ends may be ſufficiently attained without them. But, above all, it ſeems very unreaſonable, that a *Promiſe* made to perſons in *one office*, muſt be applied in the ſame manner to perſons in a quite *different office*; that a Promiſe made to *each of them ſeparate*, muſt be equally applied to others *only as in Council*; that a *Promiſe* made implying *Divine Aſſiſtance*, muſt be equally applied to ſuch, who dare not ſay, that *Aſſiſtance* is *Divine* (but *infallible*, and *after a ſort Divine*) that a *Promiſe* made of *immediate Divine Revelation*, and enabling the *perſons* who enjoyed the Priviledge of it, *to work miracles* to atteſt their Teſtimony to be *infallible*, ſhould be equally applied to ſuch as dare not challenge a *Divine Revelation*, nor ever did *work a miracle* to atteſt ſuch an *Infallible Aſſiſtance*. Yet all this is done by you in your endeavour of fetching the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, out of thoſe Promiſes of the *aſſiſtance* of *Chriſt* and his *Spirit*, which were made to the *Apoſtles*. Theſe general Conſiderations, do ſufficiently enervate the force of your whole Chapter, which yet I come particularly to conſider.

§. 2.

His *Lordſhip* tells *A. C. That in the ſecond ſenſe of Church-Tradition, he cannot find that the Tradition of the preſent Church is of Divine and Infallible Authority, till* A. C. *can prove that this company of men* (*the* Roman *Prelates and Clergy he means*) *are ſo fully, ſo clearly, ſo permanently aſſiſted by Chriſt, and his Spirit, as may reach to Infallibility, much leſs to a Divine Infallibility, in this or any other Principle which they teach.* In anſwer to this, you tell us, *That the Biſhop declines the Queſtion by withdrawing his Reader from the theſis, to the hypotheſis; from the Church, to the Church of* Rome. But, Is it not ſufficiently known to all perſons who deal in this Controverſie, what you mean by the *Catholick Church* in this Controverſie, that it ſhall not be lawful *for his Lordſhip in a Parentheſis*, to ſhew where you place this *Infallibility*, but he muſt be charged with declining the Queſtion? This only ſhews a deſire to *cavil* at little things, when you were unable to anſwer greater. Beſides, in the way you take of proving the *Churches Infallibility* by the *Motives of Credibility*, there is a neceſſity even in this Controverſie, of declaring what that *Catholick Church* is, which muſt be known by theſe *Motives*; and therefore you have no cauſe to look upon this as running away from

Sect. 16. n. 26.

p. 93. n. 1.

from the Queſtion. *That* A. C. *after a long and ſilent attention, did meerly, through the heat of his zeal, become earneſt in this buſineſs, to do his Adverſary good.* I muſt believe it, becauſe you tell me ſo, though I ſee no great *Motive of Credibility* for it. And on that account did deſire him, *to conſider the Tradition of the Church, as of a Company of men infallibly aſſiſted. For ſuch aſſiſtance* (you ſay) *is neceſſary as well to have ſufficient aſſurance of the true Canon of Holy Scripture, as to come to the true meaning and interpretation thereof.* But this is as eaſily denied as ſaid. We wait therefore for your proofs.

P. 91. n. 26. That which only ſeems here intended for that end, is, That *when the Relator had ſaid, The Prophets under the Old Teſtament, and the Apoſtles under the New, had ſuch an Infallible Divine Aſſiſtance; but neither the High Prieſt with his Clergy in the Old, nor any Company of Prelates or Prieſts in the New, ſince*

P. 97. n. 1. *the Apoſtles, ever had it.* To this you reply, *That the like aſſiſtance (with the Prophets and Apoſtles) the High Prieſt with his Clergy had in the Old Teſtament, as we gather out of* Deut. 17. 8, *&c. Where in doubts the people were bound, not only to have recourſe to the High Prieſt and his Clergy, but to ſubmit and ſtand to their judgement. Much more then ought we to think, that there is ſuch an obligation in the New Teſtament; which could not ſtand without Infallibility. Witneſs the infinite diſſentions and diviſions in Points of Faith, amongſt all the different Chriſtians that deny it.*

Two things the force of this argument lyes in. 1. *That there was Infallibility in the High Prieſt and his Clergy under the Law.* 2. *That if there were ſo then, there ought to be ſo now.* Both theſe muſt be conſidered.

1. *That there was Infallibility in the High Prieſt and his Clergy under the Law*, which you prove from *Deut.* 17. 8. *Becauſe there the people were not only to have recourſe to them, but to ſubmit and ſtand to their judgement.* This argument in form, is this. Where there is to be not only a recourſe, but an *obligation to ſubmiſſion*, there muſt be *Infallibility*; but there were both theſe among the *Jews*, as to the *High Prieſt and his Clergy*; *ergo*. You may ſee how forcible this argument is in a like caſe: Where there is to be not only a recourſe in matters of difficulty, but an obligation to *ſubmit* and ſtand to their *judgement*, there muſt be *Infallibility*; but to the *Parliament* of *England* there ought to be not only a recourſe in matters of *difficulty*, but a *ſubmiſſion to their judgement*; therefore the *Parliament* of *England* is as *infallible* as the *High Prieſt and Clergy* under the *Law*, by the very argument by you produced. The ſame will hold for all *Courts of Juſtice*. But, Can you by no means diſtinguiſh between an *obligation to ſubmiſſion*, and an *obligation in conſcience to aſſent* to what is determined as *infallibly true*? Is every perſon in all judiciary *Caſes*, where ſubmiſſion is required, bound to believe the *Judges* ſentence *infallible*? If ſo, we need not go over the *Alps* for *Infallibility*, we may have it much cheaper at home: But, I ſuppoſe you will reply, The caſe is very different, becauſe in the Text by you produced, 1. *Not Civil Matters*, but *Religious* are ſpoken of. 2. That not any *Civil Magiſtrates*, but the *High Prieſt and his Clergy* are the *Judges* mentioned. 3. That not every kind of *Judgement*, but an *Infallible Judgement* is there ſet down. But, if every one of theſe be falſe, you will ſee, what little advantage comes to your cauſe by this Teſtimony; which I ſhall in order demonſtrate.

1. That this place ſpeaks not of *Religious Cauſes*, as ſuch; but of *Civil Cauſes*, *i. e.* not of *matters of Doctrine* to be decided as *true* or *falſe*, but *matters* of *Juſtice* to be determined as to *right* and *wrong*. Not but that ſome things concerning the *Eccleſiaſtical Polity* of the Nation might be there decided; for it was impoſſible in a Nation, whoſe *Laws* depended on their *Religion*, to ſeparate the one from the other: But, that the *Judgement* given there, did not determine the *truth* and *falſhood* of things, ſo as to oblige

mens

mens consciences to believe them; but did so peremptorily decide them, that the persons concerned were bound to acquiesce in that determination. For the proof of this, one would think, the very reading of the place were sufficient. *If there arise a matter too hard for thee in Judgement, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversie within thy gates, then shalt thou arise and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall chuse*, &c. Which words are so generally expressed, on purpose to take in all manner of controversies which might rise among them, whether civil, criminal, or ceremonial. And herein *God* makes provision against any *rupture* which might be among them upon any emergent Controversie, by establishing a *Court of Appeals*, to which all such causes should be brought, in which the lesser *Courts* could not agree. For that seems to be the main scope of the words, by the following expression of *Controversies within thy gates*, by which it seems evident, that the *Controversies* were such as could come to no *resolution* in those inferiour *Courts* which sate in the *Gates of the Cities*; by which it appears, that these could be no momentous *Controversies* of *Religion*, which never came under the cognizance of those *inferour* and *subordinate Courts*. By these words then *God* doth erect a *Supreme Court* of *Judicature* among them, to which they might *appeal*, not only in case of *injury*, but in case of difficulty; and those lesser *Courts*, as well as particular *persons*, were to *submit* to the *Decree* of the great *Sanhedrin*, sitting in the place which *God* should chuse, which was *Shilo* first, and *Hierusalem* after. And thence *Maimonides* so often saith, That the establishment and coagmentation of all the *Israelites*, did depend upon this place; for hereby *God* set up such a Tribunal, to which the *last Resort* should be made, and from whose determinations there should remain no further appeal. And according to the *Tradition* of the *Jews*, these appeals were to be *gradual*, *i.e.* in case any Priest should be to seek as to any *Ceremonial Cause*, as that of *Leprosie*, brought before him, he was to take advice of the *Court* of the *Triumvirate* where he lived; if that did not agree, then he was to appeal to the lesser *Sanhedrin* of 23. in the neighbour-City; if there it could not be ended, to the *Sanhedrin* of 23. at the entrance of the Mount of the *Temple*; if not there neither, then *appeal* was made to the *Great Sanhedrin*, whose sentence was final and *peremptory*, and was instead of a *Law* in the *Case*. Deut. 17. 8.

2. You are greatly mistaken in supposing that all this is spoken of the *High Priest and his Clergy*: I deny not but expres's mention is made of the *Priests* and *Levites*, as those who were supposed most acquainted with all matters of *difference* which should happen among them; and therefore were probably the greatest part of the great *Sanhedrin* (for it is a groundless fancy to suppose two distinct *Courts*, the one *Civil*, and the other *Ecclesiastical* among the *Jews*.) Nay the *High Priest* himself was so far from being the constant *President* of this *Court*, that, if we believe the *Tradition* of the *Jews*, he was not admitted to sit there, without the same previous examination and tryal which others underwent. Indeed, in the decay of the *Jewish Polity*, in the time of the *Assomanean Family*, the chief Civil Power was in the hands of the *High Priest*, on which account he might then preside in the *Sanhedrin*, but that is nothing to this place, where mention is made *vers.* 9. of the *Priests* and *Levites*, and then of the *Judge*, which is, in case *God* should raise up among them an *extraordinary person*, who should be *Judge over Israel*, then the *appeals* might be to him; but otherwise *v.* 10. *they were to do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the Lord shall chuse, shall shew thee*, which was the *great Sanhedrin*. According therefore to the sentence of this Court, whether pronounced by a *Priest*, or other, they were to act; and they that refused were punished with death.

3. Who-

3. Whoever the *persons* were, who gave this Sentence, yet it was not looked on as *Infallible*; for it is not said, *Whosoever doth not believe the judge-*
Deut. 17. 12. *ment given, to be infallibly true*; but, *whosoever acts contumaciously in opposition to it. And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest, or unto the Judge, even that man shall dye.* Besides, we are so far from reading of any promise of *Infallibility* made to the *High Priest* and his *Clergy*, or to the *Sanhedrin*, that *God* himself doth suppose a possibility of errour in the whole *Congregation of Israel*, Levit. 4. 15. And all along the Books of the *Prophets*, we see how much *God* chargeth the *Priests* with *Ignorance*, and *forsaking his way*. And, I pray, Where was that *Infallibility* of the *High Priest* and his *Clergy*, not only when our blessed *Saviour* was condemned by him, and the *Sanhedrin* both; but in that time, *when Israel for a long*
2 Chron. 15. 3. *season had been without the True God, and without a Teaching Priest, and without Law?* So that we see what very little relief you have out of this place for the Infallibility of the *High Priest and his Clergy*. But, suppose we should grant them *Infallible*, and that *Infallibility* proved from this place, What is that to us? Might not you as well challenge the *Oracular Responses* by *Urim* and *Thummim* to belong to you, as the *High Priests Infallibility*, supposing he had any? If *God* thought it fit to make them *Infallible*, and gave such express command concerning obedience and submission to their judgement, Is it not very reasonable to think, that under the *Gospel* there should be express mention made of the subject of this *Infallibility*, the place whither we should resort for *final judgements*, as there is here? Nay, had it not been far more necessary to have specified and determined these circumstances, since they are of such vast *importance* for the peace of the *Christian world?* How *easily* had all our debates been ended, if *God* had said any where in the New Testament, *When any Controversie of Faith ariseth, go to the place which I shall chuse*, viz. *Rome, and there enquire* the judgement of *the Bishop that shall sit there, and whatever he determines, that believe as infallibly true*; if we had met with any thing so express, nay, that had any seeming tendency this way, How readily should we submit our *Controversies* to his determination? But, when there is so little ground or foundation for it there, that you are fain to deduce your Infallibility, from *Gods settling a Court of Appeals* among the *Jews*; Can you think that we are presumptuous, *and deserve to be cut off, if we do not believe?* For, for all that I know, you may challenge the *sanction of the Law*, as well as the *Priviledge of it*; and your former practices would perswade us, that you believe the *Sanction* to be as valid as the other.

But (say you) *the infinite dissentions and divisions among those that deny it, make this necessary.* 1. I pray, Doth your pretence of *Infallibility* put an end to all your *divisions?* Nay, Are there not many among your selves, raised meerly on the account of this *Infallibility?* Have not many among you, grown so weary of it, that they have wished the name had never been mentioned? Are not others so ashamed of the thred-bare impertinent places of *Scripture*, commonly produced, that they have ventured the censure of your *Church* for disowning them, and have sheltered themselves under the *Infallibility* of *Universal Tradition?* Have not some ingenuously confessed, that there is no avoiding the *circle* on the common grounds? Are those no differences at all concerning the subject of *Infallibility*, and the *Superiority of Pope and Council?* Happy men! that have so many *coincident distinctions*, and such *agreeing differences!* 2. Were there not *dissentions and divisions* in the *Apostles times?* And, had it not been, think you, much better for the *Apostle*, instead of saying, *There must be heresies or divisions among you, that they which are approved, may be made manifest*, to have told them, There must be an *Infallible Judge* among you, that there

there may be no *hereſies* or *diviſions*? If you had been at his *Elbow*, what prudent advice you would have given S. *Paul* for ending all the *diviſions* in the *Corinthian*, *Coloſſian*, *Galatian Churches*, *&c.*! You muſt have told him, that it was to very little purpoſe to *woo them* by the many arguments he uſeth to exhort them ſo often to unity, and chide them as *carnal*, while they had diſſentions, when one word of an *Infallible Judge* had ended all of them. But, poor S. *Paul* knew of no ſuch thing, which made him give as *good counſels*, as the *Spirit of God* directed him to; but alas, they were but ſorry things in compariſon of an *Infallible Judge*. Give us leave therefore to reckon our ſelves among thoſe *Primitive Chriſtians*, who knew no more than we of any ſuch way to end differences, as *Infallibility* in a conſtant *Judge*, for all they had diſſentions and diviſions among them as well as we.

But you are very angry with his *Lordſhip* for taxing this pretence of *Infallibility* with *Inſolency*, and a deſign to *Lord it over the Faith of Chriſtendom*. And therefore tell him, *You go no further than Chriſt himſelf leads you by Promiſes made of this Infallibility*; That is the thing in queſtion, and muſt not be taken upon the truſt of your *Infallibility*, in *interpreting* the *places* by you alledged. When you can prove the *Paſtors* of your *Church*, to be as *Infallible* as the *Apoſtles* were, and to have the ſame *Spirit* which they had, I ſhall as little ſuſpect them of *Lording it over others as the Apoſtles*: but if it appear quite otherwiſe as to the *Paſtors of your Church*; name, if you can, a greater *Inſolency*, than to uſurp a power of preſcribing to the *Faith* of the *Chriſtian world*. As to what follows concerning your *Churches Teſtimony*, being again *Infallible* by the *aſſiſtance of Chriſt and his Spirit*, and yet not *Divinely Infallible*, it is ſo ſubtile and Scholaſtical a diſtinction, that I now begin, not to admire your ſo often uſing it; for I ſee plainly, if that *wedge*, how blunt ſoever, doth not rive aſunder the *knot*, it is like to remain for any thing you have to ſay to it. P. 97.

His Lordſhip having given one Inſtance of the *Inſolency* of your pretence of *Infallibility*, by the *dangerous errours which your Church doth hold*, *particularly in equalling the Tradition of the preſent Church to the written Word of God*, *which* (ſaith he) *is a Doctrine unknown to the Primitive Church*, *and which frets upon the very Foundation it ſelf*, *by juſtling with it*. But, being well acquainted with the Arts of your party in making a great noiſe with the *Fathers*, and particularly in this *Controverſie*, with a *citation* out of S. *Baſil's Books de Spirit. Sanct. ad Amphilochium*, and eſpecially thoſe words, *parem vim habent ad pietatem*, ſpeaking of *Traditions*; he therefore in his Margent ſo far takes notice of them, as to return this threefold Anſwer to them. 1. *That he ſpeaks of Apoſtolical Tradition*, *and not the Tradition of the preſent Church*. 2. *That exceptions are taken at this Book as corrupted*. 3. *That S.* Baſil *makes Scripture the Touchſtone of Tradition*. To this you return a threefold Anſwer. 1. *That 'tis true*, *he ſpeaks of Apoſtolical Traditions*, *but of ſuch as were come down to their preſent times*. 2. *That the Exceptions againſt the Book are unreaſonable*. 3. *That S.* Baſil *doth not make the Scripture ſo to be the touchſtone of Tradition*, *as that Scripture muſt needs therefore be of greater force and ſuperiour dignity than that of Tradition*. Becauſe therefore this is the chief place in *Antiquity* which is produced on your ſide in behalf of *Traditions*, it will deſerve a more careful examination in the particulars by you mentioned. §. 3. P. 92. P. 97.

1. You acknowledge that he ſpeaks of *Apoſtolical Traditions* and ſuch as the preſent *Church* judged *Apoſtolical*; now you ſay that the preſent *Church* is infallible in judging *Apoſtolical Traditions*, and what Traditions are ſo judged are neceſſary to be practiſed. Now I pray conſider what difficulties and ſelf-contradictions you have brought your ſelf into, by acknowledging theſe *Traditions* to have been judged *Apoſtolical* by the

present Church. For either that *Church* at that time was not *Infallible* in judging *Traditions*, and so the *present Church* of every *age* is not *Infallible*; or if that was *infallible*, *yours* is *not*; for your *Church* differs from the *Church* in St *Basils* time about these very *Traditions* by him mentioned, your *Church* not judging them *Apostolical*. Which will appear by an inspection into those things which are here accounted *Traditions* by him. Among which he not only mentions *signing believers with the sign of the Cross*, *praying toward the East*, *the oyl and the abrenunciation used in Baptism*, but *the consecration of the person to be Baptized*, *the standing at prayers untill Pentecost*, and above all, *the trine immersion in Baptism*, all which he saith come ἐκ τῆς ἀδημοσιεύτου καὶ ἀπορρήτου διδασκαλίας, ἣν ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ καὶ περιττῆς πολυπραγμοσύνης καὶ ἀπερισκέπτου φυλάξαι πεφύλαχεν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, *Out of a secret and unpublished Tradition, which our Fathers preserved in a quiet and silent manner*. Are these three last then acknowledged by your *Church* now for *Apostolical Traditions* or no? Nay doth not your *Roman Catechism* absolutely pronounce the *trine immersion* to be unnecessary for baptism? How can that become *unnecessary*, which was once *infallibly* judged to be an *Apostolical Tradition*? Either the *Church* then was out in her judgement, or your *Church* out in hers; and choose whether of those you have the more mind to? either of them will help you to contradict your self.

S. Basil de Sp. Sanct. Cap. 1.

Catechism. Rom. de baptis.

2. There want not sufficient *reasons* of suspecting that Book to be *corrupted*. You say *Erasmus* was the *first* who suspected it. Not the *first* who suspected corruption in St. *Basils* writings. For *Marcus Ephesius* in the *Florentine Council* charged some *Latinizing Greeks* with corrupting his books against *Eunomius*, protesting that in *Constantinople* there were but four *Copies* to above one thousand which had the *passages* in them, which were produced by the *Latins*. But suppose *Erasmus* were the *first*: was he not so in discovering the genuine and supposititious writings of several others of the *Fathers*? We must therefore enquire into the *reason* which *Erasmus* had of this suspicion; Who tells us in his Epistle to *John Dantiscus* the *Poland Ambassadour*, that by that time he had gone through half this work he discerned a palpable inequality in the style, sometimes swelling to a *Tragical* height, and then sinking into a vulgar flatness, having much more of ostentation, impertinent digressions, repetitions, than any of St. *Basils* own writings, which had alwaies a great deal of vigour, simplicity and candour, with great evenness and equality, *&c.* And although this argument to all that know the worth of that *excellent* person, especially in his judgment of the *writings* of the *Fathers*, will seem by no means contemptible, yet we have much greater reason for our suspicion than this meerly from the *stile*. For if you believe St. *Basil* was a man who knew how to speak consistencies, that he would not utter palpable and evident contradictions in his writings; you will have no reason to applaud your self in this as a genuine piece of S. *Basils*, at least for the latter part of it. For whereas you make this the force of his words, That *unwritten Traditions have equal force to stir up piety, with the written Word*: You could hardly have named so many words which bear a greater face of contradiction to a multitude of testimonies in his unquestionably genuine writings. For, is it not St. *Basil* who saith, *That it is a manifest falling from the Faith, and an argument of arrogancy, either to reject any point of those things that are written, or to bring in any of those things that are not written?* Is it not St. *Basil* who bids a man *Believe the things that are written, and seek not the things that are written?* Is it not the same St. *Basil*, who saith, *That every word and action ought to be confirmed by the Testimony of Holy Scripture for confirmation of the Faith of the good, and confusion*

Concil. Florent. Act. 20.

Φανερὰ ἔκπτωσις πίστεως, καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία, ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ εἰσάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων. Basil. de verâ ac piâ fide. Tom. 2. op. gr. lat p. 386.

Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πίστευε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζήτει. Hom. 29. de Trinit. Tom. 1.

Ὅτι δεῖ πᾶν ῥῆμα, καὶ πρᾶγμα πιστοῦσθαι τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, εἰς πληροφορίαν μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, εἰς ἔλεγχον δὲ τῶν πονηρῶν. In Ethicis. Reg. 16. v. Tom. 2.

Πᾶν τὸ ἐκλὸς τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς ἐκ ἐστὶ πίστεως ὀν, ἁμαρτία ἔστιν. Ib. reg. 80. c. 22.

confuſion of the evil? Is it not he who urgeth that very place to this purpoſe, *Whatſoever is not of Faith is ſin*; then whatſoever is without the Holy Scripture, being not of Faith, is ſin. Which at leaſt muſt be underſtood of ſuch things which men have an opinion of piety and neceſſity in the doing of. Theſe and many other places may be produced out of his genuine *writings* atteſting the clean contrary to what you produce this place for. What then muſt we think of him? Muſt we ſay of him as he did of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, that he ſpoke ſome things not δογματικῶς but ἀγωνιστικῶς, not as though he believed them; but for *diſputation* ſake, becauſe they ſerved his purpoſe well? Or rather, have we not much greater reaſon conſidering the contrariety of the *Doctrine*, as well as inequality of *ſtyle*, to follow *Eraſmus* his judgment concerning this Book? Eſpecially conſidering that *Bellarmin* himſelf, who ſlights *Eraſmus* his judgement herein; yet when he is pinched with a citation out of his *Aſceticks*, calls the ſincerity of that Book into queſtion, becauſe he doth not therein ſeem to admit of *unwritten Traditions*, *which* (ſaith he) *ad Amphilochium he doth ſtrenuouſly defend.* If therefore he may queſtion another Book for not agreeing with *this*, we may more juſtly queſtion this for diſagreeing with ſo many *others*. Thus you ſee, it is not meerly the *ſtyle*, and that only on the judgment of *Eraſmus*, which makes this Book ſuſpicious. And from thoſe citations produced out of other writings of St. *Baſil*, the (3.) thing evidently appears, *viz.* That he ſo makes the *Scripture* the touch-ſtone of all *Traditions*, as that *Scripture* muſt be incomparably of greater force and ſuperiour dignity, than any unwritten *Tradition* whatſoever. But *Whether Stapleton in his teſtimony meant primarily Apoſtolical Traditions, or others*, is not worth the enquiring.

Basil. ep. 64.

L. 4. de V. D. c. 7. De Amiſſ. Grat. l. 1. c. 13.

Concerning what follows, *as to the ſincerity and agreement of ancient Copies of Scripture, and the means to be aſſured of the integrity of them*, I have ſufficiently expreſſed my ſelf already. Only what you add concerning the *integrity of Traditions above the Scripture*, being new, deſerves to be conſidered. *For*, (ſay you) *univerſal Traditions are recorded in Authors of every ſucceeding age: and it ſeems much more incident to have errours ſlip into writings of ſo great bulk as is the Bible, which in their Editions paſs only through the hands of particular men, than that there ſhould be errours in publick, univerſal, and immemorial Traditions, which are openly practiſed throughout Chriſtendom, and taken notice of by every one in all ages. And from hence you inſtance in St.* Johns *Epiſtle, or St.* Lukes *Goſpel, which being originally written to particular perſons, muſt be at firſt received as authentical upon their credit: but, on the other ſide, Apoſtolical Traditions* (for which you inſtance in the *Obſervation of the Lords day, Infant baptiſm, uſe of Altars*, &c.) *in their prime inſtitution and practice being publickly practiſed and owned by the Apoſtles; it was incomparably harder, morally ſpeaking, to doubt in the beginning of theſe Traditions, than whether St.* Johns *Epiſtle, or St.* Lukes *Goſpel were really theirs or no. Whence we ſee ſome Books that were written by Apoſtles were queſtioned for ſome time, but theſe and ſuch like Traditions, were always owned, as truely and really deſcending from the Apoſtles.* To which I anſwer, 1. If you prove not ſome *Tradition* thus univerſally owned and received which we have no *record* of, or ground for the obſervation of from *Scripture*, you ſpeak nothing at all to the purpoſe; but two of thoſe you inſtance in, *Obſervation of the Lords day*, and *Pædobaptiſm*, we have as much as is requiſite for the *Churches* practice from *Scripture* it ſelf; for the other, Of the uſe of *Altars*, it were a work becoming you to deduce the Hiſtory of them from the *Apoſtolical times*, beginning at the ὑπερῶον, or *upper room* where the *Apoſtles* met after Chriſts Aſcenſion, and ſo tracing them through all the private *houſes* and *Synagogues* in which the *Chriſtians* in the *Apoſtles times* had their ſolemn Aſſemblies for Divine

§. 4.

Ibid. n. 2.

worſhip; thence bringing down the Hiſtory of them carefully through all the *perſecutions*, and producing evidences to that purpoſe, out of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Minutius Felix*, and *Arnobius*, only blotting out *non* where they ſpeak of *Altars* and *Temples* among *Chriſtians*, and telling us that ſome *Proteſtants* had corrupted their Books; that where they utterly diſown them, they did highly magnifie them; that where they ſeemed to ſpeak moſt againſt them, it was not to let the *Heathens* know that they had them: By this means indeed you are like to acquaint us with ſome *Univerſal Tradition* leſs lyable to corruption and alteration than the *Scriptures*. For this of *Altars* is the only thing by you mentioned, which ſeems any thing to your purpoſe, the other two being ſufficiently proved from *Scripture*; which acquaints us ſo much with *Apoſtolical practice*, as to yield abundant reaſon for the practice of following *Ages*. You do well therefore to wrap up all other ſuch *Traditions* as might vye with the *Scriptures* for integrity, in a *prudent* &c. For you cannot but know that this game of *Tradition* is quite ſpoiled, if we offer to come to particulars. But it is a fine thing in general to talk of the *impoſſibility* of *corrupting* ſuch a *Tradition* as had its riſe from the practice of the *Apoſtles*, and was by them delivered to ſucceeding ages, and ſo was univerſally practiſed by all *Chriſtians* as derived from the *Apoſtles*; but when we put but that ſullen *demand*, that ſuch a thing as hath no evidence in *Scripture* may be *named* which was ſo univerſally received and owned as the *Scriptures* are, how many put *off's*, and *&c.'s*. do we meet withal for fear of being evidently diſproved in the particular inſtanced in? 2. If there be ſo much greater evidence for *Tradition* than *Scripture*, whence came the very next *ages* to the *Apoſtles* to be ſo doubtful as to *Traditions*, which yet were agreed in receiving the *Scripture*? I ſpeak not of ſuch things, which we have not the leaſt evidence the *Apoſtles* ever thought of, much leſs univerſally practiſed, (ſuch as we contend the things in controverſie between you and us are) but in ſuch things which undoubtedly the *Apoſtles* did practiſe, ſo as that the *Chriſtians* of that *Age* could not but know ſuch a practice of theirs. As in that Controverſie which ſoon riſe in the *Church*, about the day of the *Obſervation* of *Eaſter*; what conteſts ſoon grew between the *Aſian* and *Roman Chriſtians* about this, both equally pretending *Apoſtolical Tradition*, and that at the leaſt diſtance imaginable from the *Apoſtolical times*? For *Polycarp* profeſſed to receive his Tradition from St. *John*, as thoſe at *Rome* from St. *Peter*. If then *Traditions* be ſo uncapable of *falſification* and corruption, how came they to be ſo much to ſeek, as to what the *Apoſtolical Tradition* was in the very next age ſucceeding the *Apoſtles*? What, Could not thoſe who lived in St. *Johns* and St. *Peters* time know what they did? Could they be deceived themſelves, or had they an intent to deceive their poſterity? If ſome of them did falſifie *Tradition* ſo ſoon, we ſee what little *certainty* there is in the deriving a *Tradition* from the *Apoſtles*: if neither falſified, then it ſhould ſeem there was no univerſal *practice* of the *Apoſtles* concerning it, but they looked on it as a matter of *indifferency*, and ſome might practiſe one way, and ſome another. If ſo, then we are yet further to ſeek for an *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Apoſtles*, binding ſucceeding *Ages*. For can you poſſibly think the *Apoſtles* did intend to bind unalterably ſucceeding Ages in ſuch things which they uſed a *Liberty* in themſelves? If then it be granted, that in matters of an *indifferent nature* the *Apoſtles* might practiſe ſeverally as they ſaw occaſion, How then can we be *certain* of the *Apoſtles univerſal practice* in matters of an *indifferent nature*? If we cannot ſo, we can have no evidence of an *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Apoſtles*, but in ſome things which they judged neceſſary. But whence ſhall we have this unqueſtionable evidence, *firſt* that they did ſuch *things*, and *ſecondly*, that they did them with

with an apprehenſion of the *neceſſity* of them, and with an intention to oblige poſterity by their actions? By what rule or meaſure muſt we judge of this neceſſity? By their *Univerſal practice*? but that brings us into a plain *Circle*; for we muſt judge of the *neceſſity* of it by their *Univerſal practice*, and we muſt prove that *Univerſal practice* by the *neceſſity* of the thing. For, if the thing were not judged neceſſary, the *Apoſtles* might differ in their *practice* from one another. Whence then ſhall we prove any *practice* neceſſary, unleſs built on ſome *unalterable* ground of reaſon, and then it is not *formally* an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, but the *uſe* of that common reaſon and prudence in matters of a religious nature: or elſe by ſome poſitive *Law* and *Inſtitution* of theirs; and this, ſuppoſing it unwritten, muſt be evidenced from ſomething diſtinct from their practice, or elſe you muſt aſſert, that whatever the *Apoſtles* did, they made an unalterable *Law* for; or laſtly, you muſt quit all *Unwritten Traditions* as *Univerſal*, and muſt firſt infer the *neceſſity*, and then the *Univerſality* of their practice from ſome *record* extant in *Scripture*, and then you can be no further certain of any *Univerſal practice* of the *Apoſtles*, than you are of the *Scriptures*: by which it will certainly appear that the *Scripture* is far more evident and credible, than any *Univerſal unwritten Tradition*.

A clear and evident Inſtance of the uncertainty of knowing Apoſtolical Traditions in things not defined in Scripture is one of thoſe you inſtance in your ſelf, *viz.* that of *Rebaptizing Hereticks*, which came to be ſo great a *Controverſie*, ſo ſoon after the *Apoſtolical Age*. For though this Controverſie roſe to its height in St. *Cyprians* time, which was about *A. D.* 250. yet it was begun ſome competent time before that. For St. *Cyprian*, in his Epiſtle to *Jubaianus*, where he gives an account of the *General Council* of the *Provinces* of *Africa and Numidia* conſiſting of ſeventy one *Biſhops*, endeavours to remove all ſuſpicion of Novelty from their opinion, *For* (ſaith he) *it is no new or ſudden thing among us to judge that thoſe ought to be baptized, who come to the Church from Hereticks; for now many years are paſt, and a long time, ſince, under* Agrippinus, *the Biſhops meeting together did determine it in Council, and thouſands of Hereticks have voluntarily ſubmitted to it.* How far off could that be from the *Apoſtolical* times, which was done ſo long before *Cyprians*? And, although S. *Auguſtine* (as it was his intereſt ſo to do) would make this to have been but a *few years*; yet we have greater evidence both of the greater antiquity, and larger ſpread of this Opinion. Whereby we may ſee, how little the judgement of *Vincentius Lirinenſis* is to be relyed on as to Traditions, who gives *Agrippinus* ſuch hard words, *for being the firſt who againſt Scripture, the Rule of the Univerſal Church, the judgement of all his Fellow-Prieſts, the Cuſtom of his Anceſtors, did aſſert the rebaptization of Hereticks.* How little Truth there is in what *Vincentius* here ſayes, and conſequently, how little certainty in his way of finding out Traditions, will appear from the words of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, in his Epiſtle to *Philemon* and *Dionyſius* concerning this ſubject. For therein he aſſerts, *That long before that cuſtom obtained in* Africa, *the ſame was practiſed and decreed in the moſt famous Churches both at* Iconium, Synada, *and other places.* On which account this great perſon profeſſeth, that he *durſt not condemn their Opinion who held ſo.* Whether this *Synod* at *Iconium* were the ſame with that mentioned by *Firmilian*, is not ſo certain, but, if it were, that can be no argument

Apud nos autem, non nova aut repentina res eſt, ut baptizandos cenſeamus eos qui ab hæreticis ad Eccleſiam veniunt; quando multi jam anni ſunt, & longa ætas, ex quo ſub Agrippino convenientes in unum Epiſcopi plurimi hoc ſtatuerint, atq; exinde in hodiernum diem tot millia hæreticorum, &c. Cyprian. ep. 73.

De baptiſm. c. Donat. l. 4.

Agrippinus omnium mortalium primus contra Divinum Canonem, contra univerſalis Eccleſiæ regulam, contra ſenſum omnium conſacerdotum, contra morem atq; inſtituta majorum, baptizandos eos qui ab hæreticis ad Eccleſiam venirent, cenſaiſſe. Commonit. l. 1. cap. 9.

Μὴ νῦν δὲ ἐν Ἀρρικῇ μόνον τοῦτο παραδεδόχθαι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ πολλοῦ καὶ πρὸ πολλῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ταῖς Συνόδοις τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὧν Ἰονίῳ καὶ Συνάδοις, &c. Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 7. c. 7.

againſt

against the *Antiquity* of it. For, although *Firmilian* say, *That we long ago, meeting in* Iconium, *from* Galatia, Cilicia, *and the neighbour Regions have confirmed the same*, viz. *that Hereticks should be baptized*; yet, as the learned *Valesius* observes, the pronoun *We*, is not to be understood of *Firmilian's* person, but of his *predecessors*; and therefore checks both *Baronius* and *Binius* for placing that *Synod*, A. D. 258. We see therefore this Opinion was so largely spread, that not only the *Churches* in *Africa*, *Numidia*, and *Mauritania* favoured it, but almost all the *Eastern Christians*. For *Dionysius* in an Epistle to *Xystus*, who succeeded *Stephanus* at *Rome*, wherein he pleads for Moderation as to this Controversie, and desires him more throughly to consider the weight of the business, and not proceed so rashly as *Stephanus* had done; he tells him in conclusion, that he writ not this of himself, but at the request of the several *Bishops* of *Antioch*, *Cæsarea*, *Ælia*, *Tyre*, *Laodicea*, *Tarsus*, *&c.* Nay, and as it appears by *Firmilians* Epistle, they made no question but this custom of theirs descended from *Christ* and his *Apostles*: For telling *Cyprian*, that in such places where the other custom had been used, they did well *to oppose truth to custom*; *But we* (saith he) *joyn truth and custom together, and to the custom of the* Romans, *we oppose the custom of truth, holding that from the beginning, which was delivered by Christ and his Apostles.* But therefore adds, *Neither do we remember when this practice began, seeing it was alwaies observed among us.* And thence charges the *Church* of *Rome*, in that *Epistle*, with violating that, and several other *Traditions* of the *Apostles*. And *Vincentius Lirinensis* still takes *Stephens part*; and all that he hath to say, is, *That that is the property of Christian modesty and gravity, not to deliver their own Opinions to their posterity, but to retain the Tradition of their Fore-fathers.* As though the other side could not say the same things, and with as much confidence as they did: but all the Question was, What that *Tradition* was which they were to retain? The one said one thing, and the other another. But, as *Rigaltius* well observes, *Vincentius speaks very truly and prudently, if nothing were delivered by our Ancestors, but what they had from the Apostles; but, under the pretence of our Ancestors, silly or counterfeit things may by fools or knaves be delivered us for Apostolical Traditions.* And whether this doth not often come to pass, let the world judge. Now therefore, when these persons on both sides had incomparably greater advantages of knowing what the *Universal Apostolical practice* was than we can have, and yet so irreconcilably differ about it, what likelihood or probability is there, that we may have greater *certainty* of *Apostolical Tradition*, than of the *Writings* of the *Apostles*? Especially in such matters as these are, in which it is very questionable, whether the *Apostles* had any occasion ministred to them to determine any thing in them. And therefore when *Stephen* at *Rome*, and those of his party pleaded custom, and consequently, as they thought *Apostolical Tradition*; it was not irrationally answered on the other side by *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, that that might be, *Because the Apostles had not occasion given them to declare their minds in it*, because either the Heresies were not of such a nature as those of *Marcion* and *Cerdon*, or else there might not be such returnings from those *Heresies* in the *Apostolical times*

to

Quod totam nos eam per eadem in Iconio qui per Galatiæ loca erant collecti in unum convenientibus ex Galatiâ & Cilicia, & cæteris proximis regionibus confirmavimus. Cypr. ep. 75. *ubi proximè* Nos non de ipsius Firmiliani personâ, sed potius de eius decessoribus accipiendum est. Vales. not. in Euseb. l. 7. c. 7.

Verum etiam omnes ferè (Ecclesiæ) quæ in Oriente magno numero Christianam ætatem profitebantur. Rigalt. not. in Cyprian. p. 145.

Cæterum nos veritati & consuetudinem jungimus, & consuetudini Romanorum, consuetudinem sed veritatis opponimus; ab initio hoc tenentes, quod à Christo & ab Apostolo traditum est ep. 75. Cypr. p. 164. ed. Rigalt. V. etiam Basil. ep. primâ Canon. ad Amphilochium. Tom. 2. p. 759.

Idq; esse proprium Christianæ modestiæ & gravitatis, non sua posteris tradere, sed à majoribus accepta servare. Ibid.

Quæ sanè sunt à Vincentio verissimè ac prudentissimè pronunciata, si non alia sint à majoribus tradita, quàm quæ majores ab Apostolis susceperant: Cæterùm, sub nomine ac persono à majorum per fatuos aut Sophistas, asinina aut Sophisti cajro Apostolicis traderentur. Rigalt. observ. in Cyprian. p. 147.

Cypr. ep. 74. 75.

to the Church; which being of so black a nature, as to carry in them such malignity, by corrupting the lives of men by vicious practices, there was less probability either of the *true Christians Apostatizing* into them, or the recovery of such who were fallen into them. To this purpose *Firmilian* speaks, *That the Apostles could not be supposed to prohibit the baptizing of such which came from the Hereticks, because no man would be so silly, as to suppose the Apostles did prohibit that which came not in question till afterwards.* And therefore S. *Austine*, who concerned himself the most in this Controversie, when he saw such ill use made of it by the *Donatists* doth ingenuously confess, *That the Apostles did determine nothing at all in it; but however* (saith he) *that custom which is opposed to* Cyprian, *is to be believed to have its rise from the Apostles Tradition; as there are many other things observed in the Church, and on that account are believed to have been commanded by the Apostles, although they are no where found written.* But, what cogent argument doth S. *Austin* use to perswade them this was an *Apostolical Tradition?* He grants, they determined nothing in it, yet would needs have it believed, that an *Universal Practice* of *succeeding ages* should imply such a determination, though unwritten. But, 1. The *Universal Practice* we have seen already, was far from being evident, when not only the *African*, but the *Eastern Church* did practise otherwise, and that on the account of an *Apostolical Tradition* too. 2. Supposing such an *Universal Practice*, How doth it thence follow, that it must be derived from the *Apostles*; unless it be first proved, that the *Church* could never consent in the *use* of any thing, but what the *Apostles* commanded them? Which is a very unreasonable supposition, considering the different emergencies which might be in the *Churches* of *Apostolical* and succeeding times, and the different *reasons* of *Practice* attending upon them, with that great desire which crept into the *Church* of representing the things conveyed by the Gospel in an *external symbolical manner*, whence, in the second *Century*, came the use of many *baptismal Ceremonies*, the *prægustatio mellis & lactis*, as *Tertullian* calls it, and several of a like nature, which, by degrees, came into the *Church*: Must we now derive these, and many other customs of the *Church* necessarily from the *Apostles*, when, even in S. *Austins* time, several *customs* were supposed to be grounded on *Apostolical Tradition*, which yet are otherwise believed now? As in that known Instance of *Infants Participation* of the *Eucharist*, which is otherwise determined by the *Council of Trent*; and, for all that I know, the arguments used against this Tradition by some men, may as well hold against *Infant-Baptism*; for there is an equal incapacity as to the *exercise* of all *acts of reason* and *understanding* in both: and, as the *Scripture* seems to suppose such *acts of grace* in one as have their foundation in the use of *reason*, it doth likewise in the other, and I cannot see sufficient evidence to the contrary; but if that place, *Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, taken in the sense of the *Fathers*, doth imply a necessity of *Baptism* for all, and consequently of *Children*; that other place, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, taken likewise in the sense of the *Fathers*, will import the necessity of a *participation* of the *Eucharist* by *Infants* as well as others. I speak not this with an intention to plead either for *this*, or for the *rebaptizing Hereticks*, but to shew the great *uncertainty* of knowing *Apostolical Traditions*; some things having been taken for such, which we believe were not so, and others which

Quantum ad id pertinet quod Stephanus dixit, quasi Apostoli eos qui ab hæresi veniant baptizari prohibuerint, & hoc custodiendum posteris tradiderint, plenissimè vos respondistis, Neminem tam stultum esse, qui hoc credat Apostolos tradidisse, quando etiam ipsas hæreses constet execrabiles ac detestandas postea extitisse. Firmil. ep. Cypr. 75.

Apostoli autem nihil quidem exinde præcepêrunt, sed consuetudo illa quæ opponebatur Cypriano; ab eorum traditione exordium sumpsisse credenda est: sicut sunt multa quæ universa tenet Ecclesia, & ob hoc ab Apostolis præcepta bene creduntur, quanquam scripta non reperiantur. Aug. c. Donat. l. 5. c. 23.

John 3. 5.

John 6. 5

which could not be known whether ſo or no, by the *ages* next ſucceeding the *Apoſtles*. And therefore let any reaſonable perſon judge what *probability* there is in what you drive at, that *Apoſtolical Traditions* may be more eaſily known than *Apoſtolical Writings*.

§. 5. By which it appears, (3.) How vain and inſufficient your reaſons are, *Why Traditions ſhould not be ſo liable to corruption as the Scriptures.* 1. You ſay, *Univerſal Traditions are recorded in Authors of every ſucceeding age; and it ſeems more incident to have the Bible corrupted than them, becauſe of its bulk and paſſing through the hands of particular men; whereas univerſal and immemorial Traditions are openly practiſed and taken notice of by every one in all ages.* To which I anſwer, 1. That you give no ſufficient *reaſon* why the *Bible* ſhould be corrupted. 2. And as little why *Traditions* ſhould be more preſerved than that. Two Accounts you give why the Bible might be corrupted by errors, *becauſe of its bulk, and paſſing through the hands of particular men.* But do you think it impoſſible, or at leaſt unreaſonable, to ſuppoſe that a Book of no greater *bulk* than the *Bible*, ſhould, by the care and vigilancy of men, through the aſſiſtance of *Divine Providence*, be preſerved from any material *corruptions* or *alterations*? Surely, if you think ſo, you have mean thoughts of the *Chriſtians* in all ages, and meaner of *Divine Providence*: For, you muſt ſuppoſe *God* to take no care at all for the preſervation of a Monument of unſpeakable concernment to the good of mankind; and you muſt conceive the *Chriſtians*, in all *ages*, to be ſtupendiouſly *careleſs* and *negligent*, either in tranſcribing, or reading the *Scriptures*, which could ſuffer errors to ſlip into them, without diſcovery of them. Do you think that the *Chriſtians* had no higher eſteem of the *Scriptures*, than of the *Uſe* of *Altars*, or any other of your immemorial *Traditions*? But, ſay you, *The one were publick, and the other paſſed through the hands of particular men.* It ſhould ſeem then, their *Altars* were upon *high places*, but the *Scriptures* were only read in *corners*, never any ſuch thing being publickly read as the *Bible*, ſo that any alteration might be there, and no notice at all taken of it. The poor *African Biſhop* found the contrary to his ſorrow, who was in ſuch danger from the people, for altering but one word according to S. *Hieroms* Tranſlation, as S. *Auſtine* reports the ſtory. But, ſuppoſe *it paſſed through the hands of particular men*, Was it therefore more liable to be corrupted? I ſhould think juſt the contrary; unleſs you could ſuppoſe all thoſe *particular men* to agree in *corrupting* it, which, conſidering the difference of *opinions*, *capacities*, and *intereſts*, is a moſt unreaſonable ſuppoſition; that ſome *verbal* and *literal miſtakes* might ſlip in, you might rationally imagine, but that therefore any great *corruptions* ſhould creep into it, argues your mean thoughts both of *Gods Providence*, and the care of the *Chriſtian world*. Well, *but ſtill it is impoſſible to corrupt your Traditions.* It were a much harder matter to free your *Traditions* from being *corruptions* themſelves of the *purity* of the *Chriſtian Church*. And why ſo hard for them to be corrupted? *Becauſe recorded in Authours of every ſucceeding age.* I had thought, all Books of *equal*, or much bigger bulk than the *Scripture*, had been as liable to *corruption* as *that*; but it ſeems not. If a *Book* be written of *Traditions*, the very *Traditions* will preſerve it *pure*, though as big as that *Livy*, *Quem mea vix totum bibliotheca capit*: But that is not all, it ſeems theſe *Traditions are recorded in Authors of every ſucceeding age*: Unhappy men we that cannot find them there! I wiſh, inſtead of writing *Controverſies*, you would write the *hiſtory* of theſe *Traditions*; but, be ſure to deduce them through the *Authors* of every *ſucceeding age*; and, I ſuppoſe, you mean, ever ſince the *Apoſtles*. I ſhall then indeed believe *Popiſh Traditions* to be no *Novelties*, but not before. But, let us grant this: Were not the *Scriptures* atteſted by the ſame Authors? No, *It ſeems, they were agreed about all Traditions, but not ſo about the Scripture.* And the reaſon is, *Becauſe the Scriptures*

were

were first delivered to private men, as S. John's *Epistle, and S.* Luke's *Gospel; but Traditions had an universal practice.* But, Can you suppose it otherwise, but that particular Books must be first delivered to private men? Would you have them delivered only to *General Councils*, or the *Pope* and his *Cardinals?* It seems S. *John* was to blame for not directing his Epistle to the *Pope*, instead of *Gaius*; and S. *Luke* his Gospel to a *General Council*, instead of *Theophilus*; for then we might have had *Infallible Certainty* of them; but now it is a plain *case*, we can have no more than *Moral Certainty* that ever they were theirs. But, for this trick, it seems, they fared the worse; *for some Books were doubted of, for many years, in particular Churches.* It is well yet, they were not discarded by your *Catholick Church*, because the *Apostles* did not put their *Books* into your *hands* to recommend them. But what if some *Books*, by some *men*, were for some time doubted of, which yet were afterwards universally received upon sufficient evidence? *Why then* (say you) *Tradition hath much advantage of Scripture.* How so? Was no Tradition, which would be accounted *universal*, doubted of by any men at any time? *No* (say you) *it is impossible it should, for universal Traditions were universally practised at all times.* Now you speak home; and nothing wants to the proof of it, but only to let us know, What these *Universal Traditions* are, which were so universally practised in all ages, containing things different from *Scripture*, which are recorded in the *Authors* of every succeeding Age. Your offer is so fair, that my request shall be very short; *name them*, and *prove them*, and I will believe you, but not before. So much for this, which, though a *digression* in this *Chapter*, yet is not from the *design* of this *discourse*.

Setting aside therefore your discourse about A. C.'s *Pen being troubled*, §. 8.
in which is nothing worth our notice; I come to the main dispute of this Chapter, which is, *Whether the Promises of Infallibility made to the Apostles, are to be restrained to their own times, or to be extended to the present Church in all ages?* We assert the former, and you the later. For which you produce this Argument, *That from these very places, Christians do infer, that the Church shall never fall away and perish. For if the assistance* P. 99. n. 3. *be not to preserve the succeeding Church, at least from some kind of errors infallibly; it may, notwithstanding all the assistance he allows it here, fall into all kind of errors one after another, and so by degrees, the whole Church might fall into a general Apostasie, and thereby perish. There must therefore be some kind of infallible assistance in the Apostles successors, by virtue of these Promises.* But, 1. Is it all one to say, There shall always be a *Church*, and to say, That *Church* shall always be *infallible?* Those, who from the places in question, do prove, that the *Church* shall never quite *fall away*, do not dream of a *present Infallibility* in your sense, but that there always shall be a number of men professing *Christianity* in the world: And, Cannot you possibly conceive, that there should be such a number of men professing *Christianity* without *Infallibility?* To help therefore your understanding a little; suppose that all the members of the *Roman Church* should in one *age* be destroyed (and, according to your former Principle, that *if a Church may err, we cannot be certain but that it doth err*; because this may be, we cannot be certain but that it is) but we only make the supposition: Do not you think that there would be still a number remaining, who profess *Christianity*, of the *Greek* and *Protestant Churches?* Yet, I hope, you will not say, that these were *infallible*. There may be then a number of *Christians*, who are not *infallible*; and that is all which is meant by saying, *That the present Church is infallible in Fundamentals, viz.* that there shall always be a *Church*, for that which makes them a *Church*, is the belief of *Fundamentals*;

and if they believe not them, they ceaſe to be ſo. That therefore which being ſuppoſed, a *Church* is, and being deſtroyed, it ceaſeth to be, is the formal *conſtitution* of it; but thus it is as to the *Church*, the belief of *Fundamentals* makes it a *Church*, and the not belief of them makes them ceaſe to be a *Chriſtian Church*; I ſpeak of an *Eſſential*, and not of an *Organical Church*; and, I know not who thoſe perſons are, who, out of thoſe places, do infer the perpetuity of an *Organical Church*; nor, if they did, doth it thence follow, they muſt ſuppoſe an *Infallible Aſſiſtance*, beyond an *Eſſential* to make it an *Organical Church*. For I cannot imagine what neceſſity can be ſuppoſed of *Infallibility*, in order to that which may be ſufficiently conſtituted without it. 2. I anſwer, the perpetuity of the *Church* doth rather argue the *Infallibility* of the *Promiſe* than of the *Church*. Which if you did conſider, you would not certainly infer *Infallibility* from a *promiſe* of *Perpetuity*. For all the *infallibility* ſuppoſable in this caſe is an *Infallibility* of *Accompliſhment* of the *Promiſe* made. As in a clear and parallel Inſtance of that *Promiſe*, *The Scepter ſhall not depart from* Judah, *nor a Lawgiver from between his feet, until* Shiloh *come*. Taking it in the moſt received Interpretation among *Chriſtians*, that the *Jewiſh Polity* ſhould remain till the days of the *Meſſias*; doth this infer, that there ſhould be a continual *Infallibility* in the *Jewiſh Polity*, becauſe there was a *Promiſe* made of its *perpetuity*? When *God* ſaith, *In* Jeruſalem *have I ſet my name for ever*, doth it follow that *Jeruſalem* ſhould be always *Infallible*? But how would you triumph beyond all reaſon, if you had but any thing like ſuch a promiſe for *Rome*, as that is for *Jeruſalem*? Suppoſing then that the *Promiſes* by you inſiſted on, ſhould be ſo far extended, as to imply a *perpetuity* of a *Chriſtian Church*, what doth that argue, but only this, that to make it appear that *Promiſe* is Infallibly true, there ſhall always be a ſucceſſion of *Chriſtians* in the world? 3. Suppoſe I ſhould grant that the *being* of a *Chriſtian Church* doth ſuppoſe the *aſſiſtance* of *Gods Spirit*, is there no *aſſiſtance*, but what is *Infallible*? If not, no one can be a *Chriſtian* without *Infallibility*; For we ſpeak of no other *aſſiſtance*, but what is neceſſary to make men *Chriſtians*; for, what makes them ſuch ſeverally, take them conjunctly makes them a *Church*. But if you, beſides what *aſſiſtance* is requiſite to make them *Chriſtians*, do ſuppoſe ſomewhat more to make them a *Church*, I pray name *what it is*; and whatever it be, it will not be owned by *ſuch* who infer a perpetuity of a *Church* out of theſe places. But if in order to that no more be meant, (as no more can be meant) than what is neceſſary to make men *Chriſtians*, then *Infallibility* will grow ſo cheap and common, it will not be worth challenging by you for your *Church*. 4. Suppoſe I grant this aſſiſtance to be *Infallible*, doth all *Infallible aſſiſtance* make an *Infallible Teſtimony*? I am ſure not in their ſenſe, who ſay the *Church is infallible in Fundamentals*, for they never offer to aſſert that the preſent *Church is Infallible* in defining what are *Fundamentals*, and what not. And this is the only *Infallibility* in queſtion, *viz.* Such a one as makes the Teſtimony of thoſe who have it *Infallible*. For ſuch a kind of *aſſiſtance* was that of the *Apoſtles*, which is only the thing enquired after. If you can therefore prove ſuch an *Infallibility* in your *Churches* Teſtimony, as the *Apoſtles* had, you do ſomething; but what is ſhort of this, is nothing at all to the purpoſe. 5. Suppoſe I ſhould grant the Teſtimony of the *Catholick Church* to be *Infallible*, yet all theſe conceſſions were nothing for your advantage, unleſs you could as evidently prove that your *Church* is the only *Catholick Church*. Which that you can never do, will appear when we come to that queſtion. 6. Suppoſe I ſhould yield the *Catholick Churches Teſtimony* to be *Infallible*, and your *Church*

Gen. 49. 10.

to

to be the *Catholick Church*; yet all this is far from proving *Pope*, or *Council*, or both to be *Infallible*. For, By what means come they to claim the *Infallibility* as belonging to them which is given to the *Church*? by what deeds are the *conveyances* ſettled of the *priviledges* of the *Church* to them? Where is it ever ſaid in *Scripture*, or in the leaſt intimated, that the *Promiſes* made to the *Church* are to be underſtood of the *repreſentative Church*? The *Apoſtles* had this Promiſe in their perſonal *capacities* made to them, and not in a *repreſentative*; how comes then the Promiſe to be underſtood of a *repreſentation* afterwards? Thus you ſee, that you are at leaſt *ſix removes* from any *title* to claim this *Infallibility* from theſe *Promiſes* by: and therefore you have little hopes that your *claim* ſhould be admitted upon ſo ſlender a *title*.

From this therefore at preſent you fly off, to the vindicating *A. C. from aſſerting Infallibility belonging to all the Doctors and Paſtors of the Church*; which yet is a very good deſign to vindicate a man from his own words. For are they not as expreſs as may be, viz. *That there is the Promiſe of Chriſt, and his Holy Spirits continual preſence*, Luk. 10. 16. Matth. 28. 19, 20. Joh. 14. 16. *not only to the Apoſtles, but to their Succeſſors alſo, the lawfully ſent Paſtors and Doctors of the Church in all Ages?* To which his Lordſhip ſaith, *Here's a deal of Infallibility indeed, and yet error ſtore.* You preſently cry out, *But what ſhall we ſay to an Adverſary that forges what Chimerical doctrine he pleaſes, and then fights againſt it?* What *Chimerical Doctrine* is that which he forges? doth he not relate *A. C.*'s *words?* and do you, or can you, deny them to be his words? But ſay you, *This was not his meaning.* I ſuppoſe you mean, *That his words as they are, are not defenſible*, and therefore you muſt have a σοφὸν φάρμακον for them: which is, *That he did not underſtand theſe words of every Doctor apart, but of Paſtors and Doctors lawfully aſſembled in Oecumenical Councils.* But, 1. Are *Paſtors* and *Doctors* never *lawfully* ſent, but when they are in *Oecumenical Councils?* for it is plain *A. C.* ſpeaks of them as *lawfully ſent*. 2. Have *Paſtors* and *Doctors* met in *Oecumenical Councils in all Ages?* I would you could prove a truly *Oecumenical Council* in any Age; but ſure you never pretend to it *in all Ages*, yet if *A. C.*'s words have any *ſenſe* in them, they ſpeak of ſuch an Infallibility, as belongs to the *Church in all Ages*. And therefore this plaiſter is a great deal too narrow to cover the ſore. But ſay you, *Every Authour is to be underſtood to mean by his words, what they will properly bear; and is conſonant with the meaning of his other words.* I moſt freely grant you this and all that follows, if you will prove it impoſſible for any man to ſpeak *non-ſenſe*, or *contradictions*; But I can more eaſily prove it very poſſible for a man to ſpeak things which *contradict* one the other, which I have ſufficiently proved from your own *dear ſelf* in this very Diſcourſe of *Infallibility*. What follows concerning the *Jeſuits pretence of Infallibility to themſelves* (proved by his Lordſhip, *from the words of the Apologiſt, to whom* Caſaubon *replies in his Epiſtle to* Fronto Ducæus, which are theſe, *Let day and night* ——— *life and death be joyned together, and then there will be ſome hope that Hereſie may fall upon the perſon of a Jeſuite*) is very well worth the obſerving, were it only for that rare and incomparable anſwer, which you make to them. In which, it is hard to gueſs whether your ingenuity or your wit ſurpaſs the other. *Rabbi Caſaubon,* κακῷ κόρακ& κακὸν ὠὸν, *muſt help him out. An Apologiſt, ſaith* Caſaubon, *avers, 'tis impoſſible for a Jeſuite to err. Who is this Anonymus Apologiſt? A Jeſuite or a Miniſter? for an Apologiſt and a Jeſuite, are no more convertible terms, than a Jeſuite and a Miniſter. How ſhall we know then, whether this nameleſs Apologiſt was a Jeſuite, or a Miniſter perſonating a Jeſuite? The Goſpel will tell us: Ex fructibus eorum cognoſcetis eos.* O rare Drollery! doth this paſs for

§. 7.

p. 94.
p. 99.

p. 100.

wit at *Rome*? or muſt we think you ſpeak theſe words in good earneſt? If ſo, your *Ignorance* is more than ordinary in theſe matters. For to paſs by your unworthy reflection on that excellent perſon *Iſaac Caſaubon*, whoſe memory is as far above your detraction, as his *learning* beyond your *reach*; and, to let go your ſcurrilous *Greek Proverb*, κακῆ κόρακι κακὸν ὠὸν (which ſome will tell you was *Greek* for a *Jeſuite*) are you really ſo *Ignorant*, that you did not know whether the *Apologiſt*, whoſe words are cited, were a *Jeſuite* or a *Miniſter*? What not he, who profeſſedly undertakes the *Vindication* of the *Jeſuits*? not he, who was ſo ſeriouſly recommended by *Fronto Ducæus* a *Jeſuite* himſelf? not he, who induſtriouſly vindicates *Ribadeneira*, *Scribanius*, *Emanuel Sa*, *Bellarmin*, and others, in their doctrine which doth moſt reflect on the *Power* and *Authority* of *Princes*? not he, who extols *Father Garnet* who was executed in *England* for the *Gunpowder-treaſon*, yet for all this not he known to be a *Jeſuite*? Are you yet to ſeek? Apply but your own rule of the *Goſpel* to what is ſaid already, and *by thoſe fruits* you cannot but know him to be a *Jeſuite*.

§. 8. But now, notwithſtanding the ſufficient anſwers which have been ſo often given to the places produced for the *proof* of the *Churches Infallibility* out of *Scripture*, you thought it no needleſs trouble in *A. C.* to mention them, and much leſs in your ſelf to vindicate them from the *Biſhops interpretation*: The places are Luk. 10. 16. *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me.* Matth. 28. 20. *I am with you always to the end of the world.* Joh. 14. 16. *The Comforter the Holy Ghoſt ſhall abide with you for ever.* That which you would infer from theſe places, is, *That an Infallible aſſiſtance is promiſed to the Church in all ages, not in its diffuſive ſenſe but repreſentative*, viz. *in the Paſtors and Doctors aſſembled in Council.* The ſubſtance of his Lordſhips anſwer to theſe places, is in theſe

P. 93. n. 28. words; *Theſe promiſes were made of continual preſence and aſſiſtance, that I grant; and they were made to the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors, that I grant too, but in a different degree. For it was of continual and Infallible aſſiſtance to the Apoſtles, but to their Succeſſors of continual and fitting aſſiſtance, but not Infallible.* To this you return no anſwer in general, but endeavour to evince the contrary from the particular places, by diſproving his *Interpretations* of them. To the firſt therefore Luk. 10. 16. *He that heareth you heareth me*, &c. His Lordſhip anſwers, *That this was abſolutely true in the Apoſtles, who kept themſelves to that which was revealed by Chriſt; but it was to be but conditionally true in their Succeſſors*, i. e. *ſo long and ſo far as you ſpeak my words and not your own. For where the command is for*

Matth. 28. 20. *Preaching, the Reſtraint is added. Go, ſaith Chriſt, and teach all Nations: but you may not Preach all things that you pleaſe, but all things which I have*

P. 101. *commanded you. The publication is yours, the Doctrine is mine; and where the Doctrine is not mine, there your publication is beyond, or ſhort of your commiſſion.* To this you reply, *That this is rather to pervert our Saviours words, than to Interpret them, is manifeſt.* And the reaſon you give, is, *Becauſe a Sectary, who denies the Apoſtles Infallibility as well as the Churches, might apply this reſtraint to the Apoſtles themſelves, as well as he now applies it to their Succeſſors.* But they are ſtrange kind of *Sectaries* indeed who deny the *Apoſtles Infallibility*, and my memory doth not ſerve me with any ſuch who aſſerted *Chriſts Infallibility* and denied the *Apoſtles*; but if there be any ſuch *Sectaries*, let us know them, that we may then ſay, There are ſome in the world who believe great *abſurdities* as well as you. However let us for the preſent, take this for a *ſuppoſition*, that any men might do ſo; whether then they might not ſay, the *Apoſtles* were only *Infallible* when they ſpake *Chriſts words* and not their own, *i. e.* delivered his Doctrine and not any other.

No

No doubt they might, and ſaid very well in it too. And if theſe be the *Sectaries* you mean, I am one of them my ſelf; For I believe, the *Apoſtles* were no further *Infallible* than as they delivered *Chriſts Doctrine* to the world, and I ſuppoſe there are many ſuch *Sectaries* beſides my ſelf. But all the difference then between the *Apoſtles* and their *Succeſſors* was this, that thoſe who heard the *Apoſtles Doctrine* had ground to believe them *Infallible* in what they delivered for *Chriſts Doctrine*; but we have no ground to believe ſo of any *Church* ſince the *Apoſtles* times, that it is *Infallible* in delivering the *Doctrine of Chriſt* to others. The promiſe then of *Infallible aſſiſtance* as made to the *Apoſtles* doth imply that *Gods Spirit* would be ſo with them, that they ſhould deliver nothing for the revealed will of *God* or the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt*, but what was really and truly ſo. And if you can from this or any other place prove ſuch an *Infallible aſſiſtance* to the *Church* of all *ages*, you do ſomething, but not otherwiſe. But for this particular place, *He that heareth you heareth me*; I have ſomething more yet to ſay, which may manifeſt how wholly impertinent it is to your purpoſe. 1. It ſeems to me very queſtionable, whether any ſuch thing as *Infallibility* be at all implyed in this place: and then certainly from hence you cannot infer a ſucceſſive *Infallibility* in the *Church*. And the reaſons why I queſtion it, are, 1. The *Apoſtles* themſelves had not that continual *Infallible aſſiſtance* of the *Spirit of God* till after *Chriſts Aſcenſion*, when the promiſe of *Chriſts* ſending his *Spirit* upon them was remarkably accompliſhed, Will you ſay then they had *Infallible aſſiſtance* by the *Spirit*, before the promiſe of that *Infallible aſſiſtance* was made to them? If then the *Apoſtles* themſelves had not ſuch a continual *Infallible aſſiſtance*, much leſs the *LXX.* Diſciples who are here ſpoken of. 2. The *meſſage* they were ſent upon did not at all require any *Infallible aſſiſtance*, for it was only a *preparative meſſage*, they not being ſent to deliver fully the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, but to tell them, *The Kingdom of God is at hand, or nigh unto you*, verſ. 9, 11. *i.e.* that bleſſed ſtate of things under the *Meſſias* is now ready to be revealed to you: the whole deſign therefore of that commiſſion of the *LXX.* Diſciples and the *Apoſtles*, when they were firſt ſent abroad, was of the ſame nature with *John Baptiſts*, *viz.* to prepare people for the reception and entertainment of that *Doctrine* which *Chriſt* ſhould deliver to them. Now what *Infallible aſſiſtance* can be ſuppoſed neceſſary in order to this? 3. The words imply nothing of *Infallible aſſiſtance* in them. For when *Chriſt* ſaith, *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me, and he that deſpiſeth me deſpiſeth him that ſent me*: the plain meaning is no more than this, They which hearken to your meſſage, and believe the *truth* of what you ſay, do therein manifeſt their *readineſs* to hearken to me, and conſequently will receive my *Doctrine*, when it is delivered to them; but they who deſpiſe this meſſage of yours, the *affront* they offer you, reflects moſt on me who *ſent* you; and they ſhall find to their ſorrow, that in *rejecting me* they reject *God* too, who will puniſh them ſeverely for it: which, that it is the meaning of the words, will very eaſily appear to any one that conſiders the ſcope and deſign of the place. Now is it not poſſible for any to declare their reſpect to *Chriſt* by receiving his *Meſſengers*, without believing thoſe *Meſſengers* to be *Infallible*? If that be poſſible, then what kind of *Infallibility* can you hence infer? 2. Suppoſe I ſhould grant theſe *LXX.* *Infallible* in what they delivered, yet nothing can be hence drawn from the *Churches continual Infallibility*, becauſe of the different reaſon of one from the other, and that will appear in theſe things. 1. Theſe were immediately ſent abroad by *Chriſt* himſelf, when there were no *Infallible writings* containing this *Doctrine*, made by himſelf or his *Apoſtles*. And was there not then much more reaſon for

ſuch

ſuch an *Infallibilty* than there can be now? 2. Theſe had ſufficient *evidences* to atteſt that *Infallibility*, by that power of *Miracles*, which they had in curing diſeaſes and caſting out of *Devils*, *verſ.* 9, — 17. And therefore thoſe they were ſent to had ſufficient inducement to believe ſuch an *Infallibility*, if they had pretended to it; when therefore you can prove the like of your *lawfully ſent Doctors and Paſtors*, either apart or in a *General Council*, you may then from hence argue ſomething toward that *Infallibility*, but not before.

In your following words you acknowledge a difference in applying this Text to the *Apoſtles* and *their Succeſſors*, *For it was true in every one of the Apoſtles apart, but it is not ſo in every one of the ſucceeding Paſtors*; and for this you give theſe Reaſons, 1. *Your adverſaries and you are agreed in it*, viz. *That the Paſtors apart are fallible.* 2. *'Tis manifeſt by experience, that many eminent Paſtors have not only been erroneous, but heretical.* 3. *There is univerſal Tradition for it.* 4. *Plain Scripture for it, that even from themſelves there ſhould ariſe ſome that ſhould ſpeak perverſe things.* Theſe reaſons I acknowledge to be ſo true, that, if you had expreſſed the *Pope* himſelf in them, you could not have proved his fallibility better, than by *Experience*, *Conſent*, and *Scripture*. But yet you have two Reſerves in a Corner, which mar all the reſt, *viz.* that from theſe places you make *General Councils infallible*, and, according to your moſt received perſwaſion, the *Pope* too. Do you ſo indeed? and from theſe places? and both of them Infallible, whether they agree or not? But if our reaſons be not ſtronger againſt any ſuch *Infallibility* deducible from theſe places, than yours are for it (for I have not ſeen any) I am content to blind my underſtanding ſo much, if I can, as to believe what you ſay, *That to give reaſons againſt your expoſition is impoſſible.* But as your reaſon in all other things is weak, ſo in this it appears, that either your *ignorance* or your *confidence* is intolerable.

P. 102.

§. 9. P. 96. The next place, is, Matth. 28. 20. *I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.* To which his Lordſhip ſaith, *Yes moſt certain it is, preſent by his ſpirit; for elſe in bodily preſence, he continued not with his Apoſtles but during his abode on earth. And this promiſe of his ſpiritual preſence was to their Succeſſors; elſe why to the end of the world? The Apoſtles did not, could not live ſo long; But then to the Succeſſors, the Promiſe goes no further, than, I am with you always, which reaches to continual aſſiſtance, but not to Divine and Infallible.* What ſay you now to this? Why forſooth, *It is the ſame anſwer as before, and therefore deſerves no further refutation.* But doth it not deſerve ſome further proof of your Infallibility from this place? Or are you content to let it go, becauſe you cannot but ſee, that a *ſpiritual preſence* and not *infallible* is hereby promiſed, either to the *Apoſtles* or their *Succeſſors*, although from other places it appears, that the *ſpiritual preſence* of *Chriſt* with his *Apoſtles* did extend to ſo high a degree, as to make them *infallible* in what they delivered for the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, but no place of *Scripture* doth aſſert ſo much of the *Churches Infallibility*. It is well then that you grant, that S. *Gregory* did not believe any *infallible aſſiſtance* in the *Paſtors of the Church*; but (you ſay) *he underſtood it of them apart*, to make which probable, you muſt produce ſome other places, where he ſaith otherwiſe of them in *Council*. But how a gracious *preſence of Chriſt* with his *Church*, which you grant *Rhabanus Maurus* meant by this place, ſhould ſuppoſe a *conjunctive infallibility* of the *Paſtors* as a neceſſary foundation and ſupport of the *Church diffuſive*, I confeſs is beyond my underſtanding; but at leaſt you ſay, *it denies it not*: neither doth it deny that you or I are infallible; but doth it therefore follow that we are ſo? What places you produce (or rather bid us go ſeek for out of the Fathers) *to prove that they, in effect*, (it ſeems then, not evidently) *do attribute*

tribute infallibility to the Church (but by no means *Divine infallibility*, for this is more than the third time that you have forbid the *Banes* between those two words *Divine* and *Infallible*) will to any that reads them appear to be capable of proving no more than the *Perpetuity of a Church* in the world; but if any of them can do any better service, I doubt not, but we shall again meet with them, and therefore shall adjourn their consideration to a more convenient place. *To prove that any of the Fathers have denyed this place to extend to infallibility*, is a very unreasonable thing which you put *the Bishop and his party upon*, because they only deliver what they conceive the meaning of places to be, without reflections on any *Heresies*, but such as were most prevalent in their own times. And if your Church had in their time challenged *Infallibility* from such places, you might have heard of their *Negative*, which at present you put us unreasonably to prove.

Your answer to *John* 14. 16. only is, *that it must be understood in some absolute sense*; and doth not his Lordship say so too, *viz. in regard of Consolation and Grace*. But if you say, there can be no other *absolute* sense, but an *infallible assistance*, you would do well to prove it and not barely to suppose it: and so likewise, what follows as to *John* 16. 13. (which his Lordship justly restrains to the *Apostles* alone) you tell us, *That you contend, that in whatsoever sense all truth is to be understood in respect of each Apostle apart, it is also to be understood in relation to their Successors, assembled in a full Representative of the whole Church. That you contend*, we grant; but we say, it is without sense or reason. And therefore come to examine what you produce for it. Your first reason, *Because the Representative of the Church in General Council, and the Bishop of* Rome *as Pastor of the whole Church, have equal power to oblige the Church to believe what they deliver, as each Apostle had*, is utterly denied, and must be more than barely supposed as it is here. Your second, which you call *the Fundamental reason* of this *Exposition* is, in short, *That the preservation of the Church requires infallibility in future ages of the Church, as well as in the Apostles times*, which is again utterly denied; And the next time you write, I pray prove your reasons well; and think not your confident producing things you know are denied by us, will serve for reasons against us. Before you can sufficiently prove that any rite of the *Church*, not mentioned in *Scripture*, had the *Holy Ghost* for its Author, especially when contrary to a custom expressed in *Scripture*, you must do more than produce a single testimony of St. *Austine* for it; who was apt to suppose the *Holy Ghost* might be pleased with such things, which the *Church*, though not therein infallible, might consent in the practice of. Which certainly is far from supposing the *Church* to have infallible assistance with it, in delivering Doctrines of Faith; because some things might be used in the *Church* which the *Holy Ghost* might be supposed not displeased with, which is the utmost can be made of your citation out of St. *Austin*.

§. 10. P. 103. n. 5. N. 6.

It seems you were aware of that disparity between the *Apostles* times and ours, as to the pretence of *Infallibility*, because the *Apostles* were first to deliver this Doctrine to the world, and after to consign it by writing to future ages; from whence it were easie to infer, there could not be that necessity of a *Continual Infallible Assistance* in the *Church*, because the Doctrine infallibly delivered by them is preserved in the *Church* by the *Infallible Records of it*. But to this your answer is considerable. *What wise man* (say you) *would go about to raise a stately building for many ages, and satisfie himself with laying a Foundation to last but for a few years? Our Saviour the wisest of Architects, is not to be thought to have founded this incomparable building of the Church upon sand; which must infallibly have happened,* P. 104. n. 7.

pened, had he not intended to afford his continual assistance also to the succeeding Pastors of the Church, to lead them, when assembled in a general Council, into all those truths wherein he first setled the Apostles. Whether you call this arguing for the *Churches infallibility*, or libelling against our *blessed Saviour* if he hath not done what you would have him, is hard to determine. I am sure, it is arguing *ab absurdo* with a witness; for if he hath not done, just as you fancy he should have done; he must venture to be accounted an *Ignoramus* and *Impostor* before, and here *to do that which no wise man would have done*, viz. *build a stately Fabrick, the Church, upon the Sands.* So it seems you account *the Prophets and the Apostles:* for if the
Eph. 2. 20. *Apostle* may be credited, *we are built on the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.* And this is it you must mean *by being built on the sand*; for herein it is plain, the *Church* is built on these, *viz.* that *Infallible Doctrine* which was delivered *by them*, but here is not one word or the least intimation of an *inherent infallibility* in the *Church* which was to be its foundation so as to secure it from all error. *And this* (you say) *must infallibly happen, if there be not the same infallibility in General Councils which was in the Apostles*; for that I suppose must be the meaning of your last words, if they be to the purpose. But how groundless your pretence of the *Infallibility* of *General Councils* is, will appear when we come to that subject; but have you so little of common sense and reason with you, as to suppose the *Church* presently notwithstanding the *Divine Revelation* of the *Doctrine of Christianity* in *Scripture* to be built on Sand, if *General Councils be not infallible?* Is there not sufficient ground to rely on the Doctrine of *Christianity*, supposing there never had been any *General Council* in the world? What was the *Church* built on before the *Nicene Council*, only on *Sand?* surely the *Wind* and *Billows* of persecutions would then have easily overturned it. What if through civil combustions in the *Empire* there could never have been any *Assemblies* of the *Bishops* afterwards, must the *Church* needs have fallen to the ground for want of *General Councils?* But why, I pray, must the *Infallibility* of the *Apostles* be compared only *to a foundation that can last but for few years?* Do you suppose that these *Apostles* never did commit their *Doctrine infallibly* to *writing*; or that these *writings* of theirs did last but for *a few years?* without one of these, it is hard to find out your meaning by those expressions. If you deny either of them, I shall readily prove them: but if you affirm both these, (as if you are heartily a *Christian* you must do) with what face can you say that *Christ*, in making the *Apostles* infallible, did lay a *Foundation* but for a few years. But thanks be to *God*, although perverse and unreasonable men are always quarrelling with the methods of *Divine wisdom* and *goodness*, this *Foundation of the Lord standeth sure still*; and, as long as the *Infallible Doctrine of the Gospel* continues, the *Church* will be built on a stedfast and unmoveable *Rock*, which will prove a much surer *Foundation* than the *seven Hills* of *Infallibility*. But this is your grand and fundamental mistake, to suppose a *Church* cannot continue without a *vital inherent Principle* of *Infallibility* in her self, which must be discovered by *Infallible* Directions from the *Head* of it: whereas we grant the necessity of an *Infallible Foundation* of Faith, but cannot discern either from *Scripture*, *Reason*, or *Antiquity*, that there must be a living and standing *Infallible Judge*, which must deliver and interpret those Infallible Records to us. We grant then Infallibility in the *Foundation* of Faith, we assert the highest *Certainty* of the *Infallibility* of that *Foundation*, we declare that the owning of that *Infallible Foundation* is that which makes men *Christians* (the body of whom we call a *Church*) we further grant, that *Christ* hath left in his *Church* sufficient *means* for the preservation

ſervation of it in Truth and Unity; but we deny that ever he promiſed ſuch an *Infallibility* to be conſtantly reſident in that *Church*, as was in the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*; and that neither any intention of Chriſt, or any reaſon in the thing can be manifeſted, why ſuch an *Infallibility* ſhould be ſo neceſſary for the *Churches preſervation*, that without it the *Wiſdom of Chriſt* muſt be queſtioned, and the *Church* built on a ſandy Foundation. Your citation of *Vincentius Lirinenſis* proves nothing but the *Churches* conſtancy in adhering to that Doctrine of Faith, which was delivered from the beginning; but how that ſhould prove a *Conſtant Infallibility*, I cannot underſtand, unleſs it is impoſſible that there ſhould be any *Truth*, where there is no inherent *Infallibility*. Thus we ſee, what very little ſucceſs you have in the attempt of proving the *Churches* continual *Infallibility* from *Scripture*.

§. 11. From hence you proceed to the conſideration of the way, How *Scripture* and *Tradition* do mutually confirm each other. His Lordſhip grants, *That they do mutually, but not equally, confirm the authority either of other. For* P. 98. n. 31. *Scripture doth infallibly confirm the authority of Church-Traditions, truly ſo called: but Tradition doth but morally and probably confirm the authority of the Scripture. This* (you ſay) *is apparently falſe*, but endeavour not to make it P. 105. evident, that it is ſo: Only you ſay, *A. C. refuſed already to grant it. Et quid tum poſtea?* Muſt every thing be falſe which *A. C.* refuſes to grant? But let us ſee, whether his *Similitude* makes it out. *For* (ſaith he) *'tis as a Kings Embaſſadours word of mouth, and his Kings Letters bear mutual witneſs to each other. Juſt ſo indeed* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *For his Kings Letters of Credence under hand and Seal, confirm the Embaſſadours authority infallibly to all that know his Seal and hand: But the Embaſſadours word of mouth confirms his Kings Letters, but only probably. For elſe, Why are they call'd Letters of Credence, if they give not him more credit, than he gives them?* To which you make a large Reply. 1. *That the Kings hand and Seal cannot confirm infallibly to a Foreign King, who neither knows hand nor Seal, the Embaſſadours authority; and therefore this reacheth not the buſineſs, How we ſhould know infallibly, that the Scripture is Gods Word.* 2. *That the primary reaſon, Why the Embaſſadour is admitted, is his own credit, to which correſpond the motives of Credibility of the Church, by which the Letters of Credence are admitted.* 3. *That none can give authority to the Letters of Credence, or be infallibly certain of them, but ſuch as infallibly know that hand and Seal.* 4. *That none can infallibly know that hand and Seal, but ſuch as are certain of the Embaſſadours ſincerity.* But, Doth all this diſprove what his *Lordſhip* ſaith, That though there be a *mutual Teſtimony*, yet it *is not equal*; for, although the *Letters of Credence* might be the ſooner read and admitted of, on the *Embaſſadours Reputation* and Sincerity, yet ſtill thoſe *Letters* themſelves, upon the delivery of them, may further, and in a higher degree, confirm the *Prince* he is ſent to, of his *authority* to act as *Embaſſadour*. Suppoſing then, that there be a ſufficient *Teſtimony*, that theſe *Letters* were ſealed by the *Secretary* of *State*, who did manifeſt his *Sincerity* in the higheſt manner in the *ſealing* of them; though a *Foreign Prince* might not know the *hand and Seal*, yet upon ſuch a creditable Teſtimony, he may be aſſured that they were *ſealed* by the *Prince* himſelf. But then withal, if the *Embaſſadour*, to aſſure the *Prince*, offers his own *life* to atteſt the truth of his *Credentials*, and the *Prince* by reading the *Letters*, find ſomething in them which could not be written by any other than that *Prince*, he then hath the higheſt certainty he can deſire. This is the caſe between *Tradition* and *Scripture*; *General Tradition* at firſt makes way for the firſt admiſſion of *Scripture*, as the general repute of an *Embaſſadours* coming doth for his *acceſs* to the *Prince*; the particular *Tradition* of the *Church*, is like the *Embaſſadours* affirming to the *Prince*, that he hath Letters of *Credence* with him; but then, when he enquires into the *Certainty*

of those *Letters*; those *Motives* of *Credibility* (not which relate to the *person* of the *Embassadour*) but which evidently prove the *sealing* of those *Letters* (as the constant *Testimony* of such who were present at it, the *Secretaries* and *Embassadours* venturing their lives upon it) must confirm him in that; and lastly, his own reading the *Credentials*, give him the highest *Confirmation*, *i. e.* The testimony of those who saw the miracles of *Christ and his Apostles*, and confirmed the *Truth* of their *Testimony*, by their dying for it, are the highest inducement to our believing that the *Scriptures* were sealed by *God* himself in the miracles wrought, and written by his own hand, his *Spirit* infallibly assisting the *Apostle*; but still, after all this when in these very *Scriptures* we read such things as we cannot reasonably suppose could come from any but *God* himself; this doth in the highest degree settle and confirm our *Faith*. Therefore, as to the main scope for which this Similitude was used by his *Lordship*, it holds still; but your mistake lyes, in supposing that the *Embassadours* reception depended wholly on his own single *Testimony*, and that was enough to make any *Prince* infallibly certain that his Letters of *Credence* are true, which cannot be, unless he knows before-hand that *Embassadour* to be *infallibly true*, which is impossible to be supposed at his first reception. Yet this is plainly your case, that the *Scriptures* are to be infallibly believed on the single Testimony of the *present Church*, which is, to make the *Embassadour* himself give *authority* to his *Letters* of *Credence*, and set *hand and seal* to them. Whereas the contrary is most evident to be true. But then, supposing these *Credentials* admitted, the *Prince* transacts with the *Embassadour*, according to that *power* which is conveyed to him therein. And thus it is in the present case: Not as though a *Prince* treated every *Envoy* with equal respect to an *Embassadour*, no more ought any *Pastors* of the *Church* be received, but according to that power and authority which their *Credentials*, *viz.* the *Scriptures* do convey to them. We own therefore the *Apostles* as *Gods* immediate *Embassadours*, whose *miracles* did attest their commission from Heaven to all they came to; and no persons could pretend ignorance, that this is *Gods hand and Seal*; but all other *Pastors* of the *Church* we look on only as *Agents* settled to hold *correspondency* between *God* and *Us*, but no extraordinary *Embassadours*, who must be looked on as immediately transacting by the *Infallible Commission* of *Heaven*. When therefore the *Pastor* or *Pastors* of your *Church* shall bring new *Credentials* from Heaven, attested with the same *Broad-seal* of *Heaven*, which the *Apostles* had, *viz.* *Miracles*, we shall then receive them in the same capacity as *Apostles*, *viz.* acting by an *Infallible Commission*, but not till then. By which I have given a sufficient Answer to what follows, concerning the credit which is given to *Christ's Legats* as to himself; for hereby it appears they are to have no greater authority than their *Commission* gives them. Produce therefore an Infallible *Commission* for your *Pastors Infallibility*, either apart, or conjunctly, and we shall receive it; but not else. Whether *A. C.* in the words following, doth in terms attribute *Divine and Infallible authority to the Church, supposing it infallibly assisted by the Holy Ghost*, is very little material; for, Whether he owns it or no, it is sufficient that it necessarily follows from his Doctrine of *Infallibility*. For, How can the *Church* be infallible by virtue of those *Promises*, wherein *Divine Infallibility*, you say, is promised, and by virtue of which the *Apostles* had *Divine Infallibility*, and yet the *Church* not to be *divinely Infallible*? The remainder of this Chapter, which concerns the *sense* of the *Fathers* in this Controversie, will particularly be considered in the next, which is purposely designed for it.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

The Senſe of the Fathers in this Controverſie.

The Judgement of Antiquity enquired into, eſpecially of the three firſt Centuries; and the reaſons for it. The ſeveral Teſtimonies of Juſtin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, *and all the Fathers who writ in vindication of Chriſtian Religion, manifeſted to concur fully with our way of reſolving Faith.* T. C.*'s Anſwers to* Vincentius Lirinenſis, *à* Gandavo, *and the Fathers produced by his Lordſhip, pitifully weak. The particulars of his ninth Chapter examined.* S. Auguſtine*'s Teſtimony vindicated.* T. C.*'s nauſeous Repetitions ſent as Vagrants to their ſeveral homes. His Lordſhips Conſiderations found too heavy for* T. C.*'s Anſwers. In what ſenſe the Scripture may be called a Præcognitum. What way the Jews reſolved their Faith. This Controverſie, and the firſt Part, concluded.*

§. 1. HAving thus largely conſidered, whatever you could pretend to, for the advantage of your own cauſe, or the prejudice of ours, from *Reaſon* and *Scripture*; nothing can be ſuppoſed to remain conſiderable, but the judgement of the *Primitive Church* in this preſent Controverſie. And next to *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, I attribute ſo much to the ſenſe of the *Chriſtian Church* in the *ages* next ſucceeding the *Apoſtles*, that it is no mean confirmation to me of the truth of the *Proteſtant Way of reſolving Faith*, and of the *falſity of yours*, that I ſee the one ſo exactly concurring, and the other ſo apparently contrary to the unanimous *Conſent* of *Antiquity*. For, though you love to make a great noiſe with *Antiquity*, among perſons meanly converſant in it; yet thoſe who do ſeriouſly and impartially enquire into the ſenſe of the *Primitive Church*, and not gueſs at it by the *ſhreds* of *Citations* to your hands in your own writers (which is generally your way) will ſcarce in any thing more palpably diſcern your jugling and impoſtures than in your pretence to *Antiquity*. I ſhall not here enquire into the corruptions crept into your *Church* under that *diſguiſe*, but, as occaſion is miniſtred to me, in the following diſcourſe, ſhall endeavour to *pluck* it off, but ſhall keep cloſe to the matter in queſtion. Three things then I deſign in this Chapter.

1. To ſhew the concurrence of *Antiquity* with us in the reſolution of Faith.

2. Examine what you produce from thence, either to aſſert your own way, or enervate ours.

3. Conſider what remains of this Controverſie in your Book.

1. For the manifeſting the concurrence of *Antiquity* with us; I ſhall confine my preſent diſcourſe to the moſt pure and genuine *Antiquity*, keeping within the compaſs of the *three firſt Centuries*, or at leaſt, of thoſe who have purpoſely writ in vindication of the *Chriſtian Faith*. Not that I do in the leaſt diſtruſt the conſent of the *ſucceeding* Writers of the *Primitive Church*, but upon theſe Reaſons. 1. Becauſe it would be too large a *task* at preſent to undertake, ſince no neceſſity from what you object, but only my deſire to clear the *Truth*, and rectifie the *miſtakes* of ſuch, who are led blindfold under the pretence of *Antiquity*, hath led me to this diſcourſe. 2. Becauſe in reaſon they could not but underſtand beſt the ways and methods uſed by the *Apoſtles* for the perſwading men to the *Chriſtian Faith*; and if they had mentioned any ſuch thing as an *Infallibility* always to continue in the *Church*, thoſe *Paſtors* certainly who received the care of

the *Church* from the *Apoſtles* hands, could not but have heard of it: And were ſtrangely to blame if they did not diſcover and make uſe of it. Whatever therefore of truly *Apoſtolical Tradition*, is to be relyed on in ſuch caſes, muſt be conveyed to us from thoſe perſons who were the *Apoſtles immediate Succeſſors*; and if it can be made manifeſt that they heard not of any ſuch thing, in that, when occaſion was offered, they are ſo far from mentioning it, that they take ſuch different ways of ſatisfying men, which do manifeſtly ſuppoſe that they did not believe it. I know ſome of the greateſt *Patrons* of the *Church of Rome*, and ſuch who know beſt how to manage things with beſt advantage for the intereſt of that *Church*, have made little account of the *three firſt ages*, and confined themſelves within the compaſs of the *four firſt Councils*, upon this pretence, becauſe the *Books* and *Writers* are ſo *rare* before, and that thoſe *perſons* who lived then, had no occaſion to write of the matters in Controverſie between them and us. But if the ground why thoſe other things which are not determined in *Scripture*, are to be believed by us, and practiſed as neceſſary, be, that they were *Apoſtolical Traditions*, Who can be more competent *Judges* what was ſo, and what not, than thoſe who lived neareſt the *Apoſtolical times?* and thoſe certainly (if they writ of any thing) could not write of any thing of more concernment to the *Chriſtian world*, than the knowledge of ſuch things would be; or at leaſt we cannot imagine but that we ſhould find expreſs intimations of them, where ſo many, ſo wiſe, and learned perſons do induſtriouſly give an account of themſelves, and their ſolemn actions to their *Heathen perſecutors*. But however ſilent they may be in other things, which they neither heard, nor thought of, as in the Cuſtoms controverted between the *Papiſts* and us (which, no doubt, is the true reaſon why the *three firſt ages* are declined by *Cardinal Perron*) yet there is not the leaſt ſhadow of pretence, why they ſhould be ſilent in this preſent Controverſie, ſince the great buſineſs of their writings was to vindicate the *Chriſtian Faith*, to perſwade the *Heathens* to believe it, and to manifeſt the grounds on which they were induced to believe themſelves. If therefore in this they do unanimouſly concur with that *reſolution of Faith* I have already laid down, nothing can be deſired more for the evidence and confirmation of the truth of our way, than that it is not only moſt conſonant to *Scripture*, but built on the trueſt *Reaſon*, and was the very ſame which the *Primitive Chriſtians* uſed when they gave an *account of their Faith*: Which I ſhall do, not by ſome mangled *citations*, but deducing it from the ſcope and deſign of their writings, and drawing it ſucceſſively down from the firſt after the *Apoſtles*, who appeared in *Vindication* of the *Chriſtian Faith*.

§. 2. I begin with *Juſtin Martyr*, who, as *Photius* ſaith of him, was ἀνὴρ οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου πόῤῥω τῶν Ἀποστόλων, οὐ τῇ ἀρετῇ, *not far from the Apoſtles either in time or virtue*; and who being a profeſſed *Philoſopher* before he became a *Chriſtian*, we may in reaſon think, that he was more inquiſitive into the *grounds of Chriſtian Faith*, before he believed, and the more able to give an account of them, when he did. Whether therefore we conſider thoſe *arguments* which firſt induced him to believe, or thoſe whereby he endeavours to perſwade others to it, we ſhall find how conſonant and agreeable he is to our *grounds* of *Faith*, how far from any imagination of the *Churches Infallibility*. In the beginning of his excellent *Dialogue* with *Trypho*, (if I may conjecture) he repreſents the manner of his converſion in a *Platonical way*, introducing a ſolemn conference between himſelf, and an ancient perſon of great gravity, and a venerable aſpect in a ſolitary place, whither he was retired for his meditations. *Pet. Halloix* is much troubled who this perſon ſhould be, Whether an *Angel* in humane

Phot. biblioth. Cod. 234.

Pet. Halloix in vit. Juſt. Mart. cap. 2. *in fin.*

mane ſhape, or a man immediately conveyed by an *Angel* to diſcover *Chriſtianity* to him, which when he had done, he was as ſuddenly carried back again. *Scultetus* (I ſuppoſe from the ſtory) aſſerts *Juſtin Martyr* to be converted by *Divine Revelation*. But, if I be not much miſtaken, this whole *Conference* is no more than the ſetting forth the grounds of his becoming a *Chriſtian* in the *Platonical mode*, by way of *Dialogue* (and probably the whole *Diſputation* with *Trypho*, may be nothing elſe) but, however that be, it is apparent *Trypho* looked on him as a *Platoniſt*, by his *Pallium*, and *Juſtin Martyr* owns himſelf to have been ſo, and therefore it was very congruous for him to diſcourſe after the *Academick manner*. In which diſcourſe, when *Juſtin Martyr* had ſtood up in vindication of the *Platonick Philoſophy*, the other Perſon endeavours to convince him of the impoſſibility of attaining true happineſs by any *Philoſophy*. For when *Juſtin* had ſaid, That by *Philoſophy* he came to the *Knowledge of God*; the other perſon demanded, How they could know *God*, who had never ſeen him, nor heard him? He replied, That the τὸ θεῖον was μόνῳ νῷ καταλητὸν, *God was only intelligible by our minds, as* Plato *ſaid*: He again asks, *Whether there were ſuch a faculty in the minds of men, as to be able to ſee God without a Divine Power and Spirit aſſiſting it?* *Juſtin* anſwers, that according to *Plato*, *the eye of the underſtanding was ſufficient to diſcover that there is ſuch a Being, which is the cauſe of all things, but the nature of it is inexpreſſible and incomprehenſible.* Upon which he proceeds to enquire, What *relation there was between God and the Souls of men, and what means to come to the participation of him*; after a great deal of diſcourſe on which ſubject between them, *Juſtin* comes at laſt to enquire, *if there were not truth and certainty in Philoſophy, By whoſe inſtruction, or by what means he ſhould come to it?* To which that perſon returns this excellent Anſwer, *That there had been, a long time ſince, ſeveral perſons much elder than the reputed Philoſophers, bleſſed men, juſt, and lovers of God, ſpeaking by the inſpiration of the Divine Spirit, foretelling things which have come to paſs ſince, whom they call Prophets. Theſe only ſaw the Truth, and declared it to men; neither flattering, nor fearing any, nor conquered with the love of honour: But they only ſpake the things which they heard and ſaw, being filled with the Holy Spirit. Whoſe Books are ſtill extant; which, whoſoever reads, and aſſents to, will find himſelf much improved in the principles and ends of things, and whatever becomes a Philoſopher to know. For, they writ not by way of argument or demonſtration, but, that which is above it, they are moſt faithful witneſſes of Truth. For the things which have, and do come to paſs, do enforce men to believe the Truth of what they ſpake: And not only ſo, but they are moſt worthy to be believed, for the Miracles which they wrought. Moreover, they extol the Maker of the World, God and the Father, and declare to the World his Son Chriſt: which the falſe Prophets, who are acted by a ſeducing and impure ſpirit, neither have done, nor yet do doe; but they attempt to ſhew ſome tricks for the amazement of men, and cry up the evil and deceiving ſpirits. But, do thou, above all things, pray, that the gates of light may be opened to thee. For theſe things are not ſeen nor underſtood by all, but only by them to whom God and Chriſt ſhall grant the knowledge of them.* A moſt ſignal and remarkable Teſtimony (as any is extant in all Antiquity) for acquainting us with

Medulla Patr. p. 9.

Ἐγένοντό τινες πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου, πάντων τούτων τῶν νομιζομένων φιλοσόφων παλαιότεροι, μακάριοι καὶ δίκαιοι, καὶ θεοφιλεῖς, θεόπνευστοι λαλήσαντες, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα θεσπίσαντες, ἃ δὴ νῦν γίνεται, προφῆται δὲ αὐτοὺς καλοῦσι· οὗτοι μόνοι τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ οὐδὲν καὶ οὐδενὶ ἀνθρώποις, μήτ' εὐλαβηθέντες, μήτε δυσωπηθέντες τινὰ, μὴ ὑπὸ τριῶν ὁ δόξης, ἀλλὰ μόνα ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἃ ἤκουσαν καὶ ἃ εἶδον, ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πληρωθέντες πνεύματι. Συγγράμματα δ' αὐτῶν ἔτι καὶ νῦν διαμένει, καὶ ἔστιν ἐντυχόντα τούτοις πλεῖστον ὠφεληθῆναι τὸν ἀναγνόντα, καὶ πίστευσαι τούτοις ἃ ἐκείνοις. ἃ γὰρ μετὰ ἀποδείξεως πεποίηκαν τότε τῆς λόγου, ἄξια ἀναπόφευκτα πάσης ἀποδείξεως ὄντες ἀξιόπιστοι μάρτυρες τῆς ἀληθείας· τὰ δὲ γινόμενα καὶ γενησόμενα ἀναγκάζει συντίθεσθαι τοῖς λελαλημένοις δι' αὐτῶν· ἔτι τοίνυν καὶ διὰ τὰς δυνάμεις ἃς ἐποίησαν, πιστεύεσθαι δίκαιοι ἦσαν· ἐποίησαν γὰρ καὶ ἀποιοῦσι τὸν ὅλων θεὸν καὶ πατέρα ἐδόξαζον, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ χειρὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ κατήγγελλον, ὅπερ οἱ ἐν τῇ πλάνῃ καὶ ἀκαθάρτῳ πνεύματι ἐμπεπλεγμένοι ψευδοπροφῆται, οὔτε ἐποίησαν, οὔτε ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεις τινὰς ἐνεργεῖν εἰς κατάπληξιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τολμῶσιν καὶ τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ δαιμόνια δοξολογοῦσιν· σὺ δὲ χρὴ σοι πρὸ πάντων, φωτὸς ἀνοιχθῆναι πύλας· ἃ γὰρ συνοπτά, οὐδὲ συνιέντα πᾶσίν ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ οἷς ὁ Θεὸς δῷ συνιέναι καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτός.

Juſtin. Martyr. Dialog. c. Tryph. p. 224, 225. ed. Pariſ. 1636.

with the true *grounds* and *reaſons* of *Faith*, which therefore I have at large produced. The very reading of which is ſufficient to tell us, How true a *Proteſtant* this, whether *Angel* or *Man*, was. When *Juſtin* asked him, *What Teachers he ſhould have to lead him to Truth*; He tells him, There had been long before *Philoſophers*, excellent perſons in the world, called *Prophets*, men every way good, who did nothing for fear or favour, or love of themſelves. But *Juſtin* might further ask, *How he ſhould come to be inſtructed by them?* He tells him, Their *Writings* were ſtill *extant*, wherein were contained ſuch things as might hugely ſatisfie a *Philoſophical* mind concerning the *Origin* and *Principles* of things. He might ſtill enquire, *Whether thoſe things were demonſtrated or no, in them?* No, he replies; but they deſerve aſſent as much, if not beyond any demonſtration; becauſe they manifeſt themſelves to be from God, by two things, the exact accompliſhment of the *Prophecies* made by them, and the unparallel'd *Miracles* which were wrought by them. *But, might not the evil ſpirits work ſuch things?* No: For, although their falſe *Prophets* may do ſeveral things to amaze men, yet they can do no ſuch *Miracles* as they did; beſides, all which they do, tends to advance theſe *evil ſpirits* in the world; but the deſign of the true *Prophets*, is to declare the *True God, and his Son Chriſt*. But, *May then any one, by the innate power of his mind, yield a divine aſſent to theſe things?* No: but, pray earneſtly to God to enlighten your mind; for this is the effect of *Divine Grace*, in and *through Chriſt*. What part is there now of our *reſolution of Faith*, which is not herein aſſerted? If you ask, *Why you believe there were ſuch men in the World as theſe Prophets?* The continuance of their Books and common Fame ſufficiently atteſt it. If you ask, *Why you ſhould believe them to be True Prophets?* The *excellency* of their *Doctrine*, joyned with the *fulfilling Prophecies*, and *working Miracles*, abundantly prove it. But if you laſtly ask, *Whether, beſides objective evidence, there be not ſome higher efficient requiſite to produce a Divine Faith*; The Anſwer is, That depends upon the *Grace of God in Chriſt*: So that here we have moſt evidently all thoſe things concurring, which his Lordſhip aſſerts in the *reſolution of Faith*; *Moral inducement preparing the mind*, *rational evidence* from the thing into which *Faith* is reſolved, and *Divine Grace* requiſite in the nature of an *efficient cauſe*. But, Where is there the leaſt intimation of any *Churches Infallibility* requiſite to make men believe with a *firm and Divine Faith?* No doubt that was a *Divine Faith*, which *Juſtin* was bid to pray ſo heartily for, and which was only in thoſe *to whom it was given*; and yet even this *Faith* had no other aſſurance to build it ſelf upon, but that *rational evidence* which is before diſcovered. *That Divine Perſon never thought of mens believing with their Wills, much leſs that the Books of Scripture had no more evidence of themſelves, than diſtinction of colours to a blind man; he did not think Chriſt an Ignoramus or Impoſtor, becauſe he left no Church infallible, nor that God by the Prophets laid a Foundation upon ſand, or that would laſt but a few years, becauſe he did not continue ſuch an Infallible Aſſiſtance as the Prophets had to the Church in all ages*; yet theſe are all brave *aſſertions* of yours; which, doubtleſs, you would be aſhamed of, and recant, if you had not, as *Caſaubon* ſaith of the *Perſon* whom you could not tell whether he was a *Jeſuit* or no (but by that character you might gueſs it) that he had *frontem ferream, & cor involutum*; a *brow of ſteel*, and a *heart full of Meanders* (to uſe your own fine expreſſion.) Upon this, *Juſtin* tells us, *a divine ardour was raiſed in his mind, and a love of the Prophets and ſuch as were the Friends of Chriſt*, and, upon further conſideration, πανὺ μόνον εὑρεῖσκειν φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον, *I found this the only certain and profitable Philoſophy*; and thereupon commends the *Doctrine of Chriſt* to *Trypho* and his *Company* for ſomething which was certainly innate to it, that it had a kind of

awe

awe and majeſty in it, and is excellent at terrifying and perſwading thoſe who were out of the right way, and brings the ſweeteſt tranquillity to ſuch as are converſant in it. And afterwards undertakes to demonſtrate the truth of our Religion from the *reaſonableneſs* of it, *that we have not yielded our aſſent to vain and empty Fables, nor to aſſertions uncapable of evidence and demonſtration; but to ſuch as are filled with a Divine Spirit, overflowing with Power, and flouriſhing with Grace.* And accordingly manageth his diſcourſe quite through, ſhewing the inſufficiency of the *Ceremonial Law*, and the *Truth* and *Excellency both of the Perſon and Doctrine of Chriſt.* But what need all this, if he had believed your Doctrine? It had been but proving the *Church Infallible* by *Motives of Credibility*; and then, to be ſure, whatever was propounded to be believed by it, was *infallibly true.* But *older and wiſer*, it ſeems, muſt hold here too; *Juſtin*, though ſo near the Apoſtles times, went a much further way about: but it was well for him he lived ſo long ago, elſe he might have been accuſed of *Hereſie*, or making Faith *uncertain*, if he had lived in our times, and ſuch Doctrine of his might have merited an *Index Expurgatorius.*

Πράξωτι δ' ἐρῶ, ὅτι ἃ κενοῖς ἐπιστεύσαμεν μύθοις, οὐδὲ ἀναπόδεικτοις λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἃ μέσος πνεύματος θείου καὶ συνιεὶς ἔφυσαν, καὶ εὐπλόοι χάριτι. Id. p. 226.

But, it ſeems, he was not afraid of it then, for he often elſewhere §. 3.
ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe. For, in his *Paræneſis* to the *Greeks*, he makes it his buſineſs, firſt to ſhew the *unreaſonableneſs* of believing thoſe who were the great *Authors* of all their *ſuperſtitions*; for the *Poets* were manifeſtly *ridiculous*, the *Philoſophers* at continual *diſſentions* among themſelves, ſo that there was no relying on them for the finding out of *Truth*, or the redreſs of the *miſeries* of humane nature; and then comes to the Authours of our *Religion*, who were both much *elder* than any of theirs, *Paræneſ. p. 9.*
and did not teach any thing of their own heads, nor diſſented from one another in what they delivered, or ſought to confute each other as the *Philoſophers* did, but ἀτιλονείκως καὶ ἀσυκοφάντως, *without all jarring and contention*, they delivered to men the *Doctrine* which they received from *God. For*, (ſaith he) *it was not poſſible for them to know ſuch great and divine things by nature, or humane wit, but by a heavenly gift deſcending from above upon holy men.* It ſeems, *Juſtin* believed there was ſuch evidence in the matters contained in *Scripture*, which might perſwade men to believe that they came from *God*; that they were but as *inſtruments* to that τὸ θεῖον πλῆκτρον (as he expreſſeth it) to that *Divine Spirit which did ſtrike upon them*; whence, with one conſent and harmony they ſound forth the *Doctrine* of *God*, the *worlds Creation and Mans*, *the Immortality of the ſoul*, *Judgement to come*, and all things elſe which are neceſſary for us to know, which they unanimouſly deliver to us, though at great diſtances from each other, both in regard of time and place. And ſo proves the *Antiquity* of the *Writings* of *Moſes* above all the *Wiſe men* of the *Greeks*, by the teſtimony of their own Authours, *Polemon*, *Appion*, *Ptolomæus Mendeſius*, and many others, and concludes his diſcourſe with this ſpeech, *That it is impoſſible for us to know any thing certainly concerning God or Religion, but from Divine Inſpiration, which alone was in the Prophets.* In his firſt *Apology* for the *Chriſtians*, he tells us what it was, while he was a *Platoniſt*, which brought him to a good Opinion of *Chriſtianity*, which was, the obſerving *the power and efficacy that Doctrine had upon the Chriſtians to undergo with ſo much courage what was accounted moſt terrible to humane nature* (*which are, death and torments.*) From whence he reaſoned with himſelf, that although the *Chriſtians* were ſo much calumniated, yet certainly they *could not be vitious perſons, who were ſo little fearful of thoſe great*

Οὔτε γὰρ εὑρεῖν, εἰ καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐννοίᾳ ἔστε τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα καὶ θεῖα γνῶσκειν ἀνθρώποις δυνατὸν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἀνθρώπους πνευματικαῖς καταλλήτῃ δωρεᾷ. Id. ib.

Apolog. 1. p. 50.

great Bug-bears of humane nature. For, Who is there, that is a lover of pleasure, or intemperate, or cruel, that can chearfully embrace death, so as thereby to be deprived of all his goods? And when he speaks of the Doctrine it self of Christianity, he says, It is suitable to whatever was *rational* among the *Platonists* or other *Philosophers*, but far more agreeable to it self, and containing much more *excellent things* than ever they could attain to the knowledge of. In his second *Apology* for the *Christians* to the *Emperour Antoninus Pius*, he insists much on the excellency of the *Doctrine of Christianity* from the *Precepts* of it, *chastity*, *love of enemies*, *liberality*, *submission to authority*, *worship of God*, &c. Afterwards he proves the *truth* and *certainty* of all we believe concerning *Christ* from the exact *accomplishment of the Prophecies* made concerning him in the Old *Testament*, which discourse he ends with this saying. *So many and so great things being seen, are sufficient to perswade men to believe the truth of them, who are lovers of truth, and not seekers of applause, and under the command of passions.* Thus we see, in all his discourses, where he had the most occasion administred to him, to discover the most *certain grounds of Christian Faith*, he resolves all into the *rational evidence* of the *truth*, *excellency*, and *divinity* of the *Doctrine* which was contained in the *Scriptures*. For in his second *Oration* to the *Greeks*, after he had spoken highly in commendation of the *Scripture*, calling it, *The best expeller of all turbulent passions, and the surest extinguisher of those preternatural heats in the souls of men*; *which* (saith he) *makes men not Poets, nor Philosophers, nor Orators, but it makes* τοὺ θνητὰς ἀθανάτους, τοὺς βροτοὺς θεούς, *dying men immortal, and mortals become Gods*; *and transfers them from the earth,* εἰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ Ὄλυμπον ὄρους, *to such places whose confines are far above* Olympus; *therefore, O ye Greeks, come and be instructed*; *be ye as I am, for I was as you are. And these were the things which prevailed with me, the divine power and efficacy of the Doctrine.* What was it then, I pray, that *Justin Martyr*, of a *Philosopher* becoming a *Christian*, resolved his *Faith* into? If we may believe himself, it was into the *evidence* of the *Doctrine* of *Christianity*, and not into the *Infallibility* of any *Church*. The Testimony of this person, I have the more largely insisted on, both because he was so great a *Philosopher*, as well as *Christian*, and lived so near the *Apostolical times*. Next him we produce *Athenagoras* as a *Philosopher* too, as well as *Christian*, who flourished under *Antoninus* and *Commodus*, to whom he made his *Apology* in behalf of the *Christians*, in which he first undertakes to manifest the *reasonableness* of the *Doctrine* which they owned, the *Foundation* of it being the same with that which the best *Philosophers* acknowledged, the *existence* and *unity* of the *Deity*. *But* (saith he) *if we had nothing but such reasons as he had produced, our perswasion could only be humane*; *but the words of the Prophets are they which establish our minds.* ——*who being carried beyond themselves, by the impulse of the Divine Spirit, spake that which they were moved to, when the Spirit used them as Instruments through which he spake.* Is not here a plain *resolution* of *Faith* into that *Divine Authority* by which the *Prophets* spake? and that not as testified by any *Infallible Church*, but as it was discernable by those persons he spake to, for he appeals to the *Emperours* themselves concerning it; which had been a fond and absurd thing for him to do, if the knowledge of that *Divine Inspiration* did depend meerly on the testimony of *Christians* as such, and were not to be discovered by some *common Principles* to them

Τίς γὰρ φιλήδονος, ἢ ἀκρατὴς, καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν βορὰν ἀγαθὴν ἡγούμενος, δύναιτο ἂν θάνατον ἀσπάζεσθαι, ὅπως τοῦ αὐτὸ ἀγαθῶν στερηθῇ. Id. ib.

P. 51, 52.

P. 61, 62, &c.

P. 73.

Τὰ τοσαῦτα γὰρ ὁρώμενα, πειθῶ καὶ πίστιν τοῖς τ' ἀληθὲς ἀσπαζομένοις, καὶ μὴ φιλοδοξοῦσιν, μηδὲ ὑπὸ παθῶν ἀρχομένοις, μετὰ λόγου ἐμφορῆσαι δύναται. Apol. 2. p. 89.

Ὦ παθῶν δεινῶν φυγαδευτήριον. ὦ πυρὸς ἐμψύχου σβεστικὸν διδασκαλεῖον. Orat. 2. p. 40.

Ταῦτά με ἔπεισε, τό τε τῆς παιδείας ἔνθεον καὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου δυνατόν. Id. ib.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ αἱ φωναὶ τῶν προφητῶν πίστιν ἡμῶν τοὺς λογισμοὺς ——— οἱ κατ' ἔκστασιν τῷ ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῷ κινήσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, ἃ ἐνήργησε ἐξεφώνησαν συγχρησαμένου τοῦ πνεύματος, ὥσπερ καὶ αὐλητῆς αὐλὸν ἐμπνεύσαι. Athenag. Apol. p. 9.

them and others. Much to the ſame purpoſe *Tatianus* ſpeaks in that eloquent Oration of his againſt the *Greeks*, who was *Juſtin Martyrs* Scholar; and we ſhall ſee, how agreeable he ſpeaks to him, in the account he gives, how he became a Chriſtian. *After* (ſaith he) *he had abundantly diſcovered the vanity of the Theology, and Superſtitions of the Greeks, he fell to the reading ſome ſtrange Books, much elder and more Divine than the Writings of the Greek Philoſophers. And to theſe* (ſaith he) *I yielded up my Faith; for the great ſimplicity and plainneſs of the ſtyle, and the freedom from affectation which was in the writers; and that evidence and perſpicuity which was in all they writ; and becauſe they foretold things to come, made excellent promiſes, and manifeſtly declared the Monarchy of the World.* What *Proteſtant* could ſpeak higher of the *Scripture*, and of thoſe internal *arguments* which are the grounds of *Faith* than *Tatianus* in theſe words doth? Yet we ſee, theſe were the arguments which made him relinquiſh the *Greek* learning of which he was a *Profeſſor* at *Rome*, and betake himſelf to the profeſſion of *Chriſtianity*; though he was ſure to undergo not only contempt from the world, but to be in continual hazard of his life by it. That innate *ſimplicity* of the *writings of the Scripture* joyned with the *perſpicuity* of it (if at leaſt thoſe words be rightly tranſlated τῆς τῶ πάντ☉ ποιήσεως τὸ ἐυκατάληπλον by *ſermo nuſquam obſcurus*, and it doth not rather relate *to the account of the worlds creation*, which I conjecture it may do) but however, *the certainty of the predictions, the excellency of the promiſes*, and the *reaſonableneſs of the Doctrine* were the *things*, which by the *reading* of the *Books* he was perſwaded to believe them by. But all this while we hear no news of any *Churches Infallibility* in order to *Faith*.

Καὶ μοι πειῶῆναι ταύτας συνέβη, διάτε τῆ λέξεως τὸ ἄπυρον καὶ τῆ εἰπόντων τὸ ἀνεπιτήδευτον, καὶ τὸ τῶ πάντ☉ ποιήσεως τὸ ἐυκατάληπλον, καὶ τῆ μελλόντων τὸ προγνωσικὸν, καὶ τῆ ἀγγελμάτων τὸ ἐξαίσιον, καὶ τῆ ὅλων τὸ μοναρχικὸν. Tatianus p. 165.

We come therefore to *Irenæus*, who was *omnium doctrinarum curioſiſſimus explorator*, as *Tertullian* ſpeaks of him, *a great ſearcher into all kind of learning*, and therefore ſurely not to ſeek as to the true account of his *Faith*. Whoſe judgement herein, although we have had occaſion to enquire into before, yet we have teſtimonies enough beſide to manifeſt his conſent with them. And although *Irenæus* of all the ancient *Fathers* be looked on as the moſt favourable to *Tradition*, and is moſt cited to that purpoſe in theſe diſputes; yet I doubt not but to make it appear, that where he ſpeaks moſt concerning *Tradition*, he makes the *reſolution* of *Faith* to be wholly and intirely into the *Scripture*: and they who apprehend otherwiſe do either take the *citations* out of him upon truſt, or elſe only ſearch him for the *words* of thoſe *citations*, and never take the pains to enquire into the ſcope and deſign of his diſcourſe. For clearing which, we muſt conſider, what the *ſubject* was which he writ of, what the *pleas* of the adverſe party were, what way *Irenæus* takes to confute them, and to eſtabliſh the *Faith* of Chriſtians as to the matter which was in Controverſie. The matter in diſpute was this, *Valentinus* and his *Scholars*, not being contented with the *ſimplicity* of the *Doctrine* of the *Goſpel*, and in probability the better to ſuit their *opinions* to the *Heathen Mythology*, had invented a ſtrange *Pedigree* of *Gods*, the better as they pretended to give an account of the *production of things*, and the various *diſpenſations* which had been in the *world*: but knowing that the *Chriſtians* did with the greateſt reſolution adhere to that *Doctrine* which was delivered by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, they could not ſuppoſe that they ſhould embrace theſe *figments* unleſs they could ſome way or other *father* them upon *them*. Upon which they pretended that theſe very *things* which they delivered were really intended by *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* in their writings, but becauſe ſo few were capable of them, they gave only ſome *intimations* of them there, but delivered

§. 4. *c. Valentin. cap.* 5.

theſe great *myſteries* privately only to thoſe who were *perfect*; and that this was St. *Pauls* meaning when he ſaid, *I ſpeak wiſdom among them that are perfect*. This *Irenæus* gives us an account of, in the beginning of all his diſcourſe: but is more fully expreſſed in the original *Greek* of *Irenæus* preſerved by *Epiphanius* in the hereſie of the *Valentinians*. On which account alone, as *Petavius* ſaith, *Epiphanius* hath well deſerved of *Poſterity*, for preſerving entire thoſe original *Fragments* of *Irenæus*; his *Greek* therein being much more intelligible and ſmooth than the *old harſh Latin verſion* of him. His words are: *All which things are not expreſly declared, in as much as all are not fit to underſtand them; but are myſteriouſly couched by our Saviour in parables, for ſuch who are able to underſtand them.* Thus they ſaid, the 30. *Æônes* were repreſented by the 30. *years* in which our *Saviour* did not appear publickly, and by the parable of the works in the vineyard in which the 1,3,6,9,11 *hours*, making up 30. did again denote their *Æônes*; and that St. *Paul* did moſt expreſly ſignifie them, when he uſed ſo often εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. The *Duodecad* of *Æônes* by the 12 *years* at which our *Saviour* appeared diſputing with the *Doctors*. The raiſing of *Jarus* his daughter of 12 *years*, repreſented *Achamoth* being *brought to light*, whoſe *paſſions* were ſet forth by thoſe words of our Saviour, *My God, My God, why haſt thou forſaken me*, in which were three *paſſions* of *Achamoth*, *Sorrow*, *Fear*, and *Deſpair*. With many things of a like nature; but hereby we ſufficiently ſee what their pretence was, *viz. That there were deep myſteries but obſcurely repreſented in Scripture, but whoſe full knowledge was delivered down by an Oral Cabala from Chriſt and his Apoſtles.*

Iren. l. 1. c. 1. p. 4. ed. Eraſm.

Petav. not. in Epiph. in hæreſ. Valent.

Ταῦτα δὲ φανερῶς μὲν μὴ εἰρῆσθαι, διὰ τὸ μὴ πάντας χαρεῖν τῇ γνώσει· μυστικῶς δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος διὰ παραβολῶν μεμυῆσθαι τοῖς συνιεῖν δυναμένοις. Iren. apud Epiph. hæreſ. 31. ſect. 14.

L. 1. c. 2. Now we muſt conſider, what courſe *Irenæus* takes to confute theſe *pretenſions* of theirs. Firſt he gives an account what that *Faith* was, which the *Church* diſperſed up and down the world, received from the *Apoſtles* and their *Diſciples*, viz. that thereby *they believed in one God, the Father Almighty, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea and all in them, and in one Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God*, &c. which was directly contrary to the *Valentinian Hereſies*, who ſuppoſed the Supream God and *Demiurgus* to be different, and ſo *Chriſtus* and *Salvator*, and ſo in others. *This Faith which the Church hath received, it unanimouſly keeps, though diſperſed through the whole world; for although the languages be different, yet the Tradition is the ſame among them; whether they live in* Germany, France, Spain, *the* Eaſt, Ægypt, Libya, *or elſewhere.* And after in the firſt *Book* he hath ſhewed the many different opinions of the ſeveral *broods* of theſe *Hereticks*; and in the ſecond diſcovered the *fondneſs and ridiculouſneſs* of them; in his third *Book*, he undertakes from *Scripture* to ſhew the *falſeneſs* of them. And begins with that excellent expreſſion before cited. *For we have not known the diſpoſition (or œconomy) of our Salvation by others than by thoſe, by whom the Goſpel came to us, which they then firſt preached, and after by the will of God, delivered to us in writings to be the Foundation and Pillar of our Faith.* Which being laid down by him at his entrance as the grand *principle* on which he goes, will lead us to an eaſie underſtanding of all that follows. This therefore, he not only aſſerts, but proves. For whereas ſome of the *Adverſaries* pretended that the *Apoſtles* preached before they fully *underſtood all they were to know*, he ſhews how falſe that was, becauſe after *Chriſts Reſurrection* from the *grave*, they were endued with the *Spirit of God* deſcending from on high upon them; and were furniſhed with a perfect *knowledge* by which they went up and down preaching the *Goſpel*, which all and each of them had the knowledge of. Thus *Matthew* in the *Hebrew* tongue ſet forth his *Goſpel*, when *Peter* and *Paul* at *Rome* preached the *Goſpel* and founded a *Church*; and after their departure *Mark*, the *Diſciple* and *Interpreter* of *Peter*, writ thoſe things

L. 1. c. 3.

L. 3. c. 1.

things which were preached. Afterwards *John* publiſhed his *Goſpel* at *Epheſus* in *Aſia*, *And all theſe* (ſaith he) *delivered to us one God maker of Heaven and Earth, and one Chriſt his Son. To whom if one doth not aſſent, he deſpiſeth thoſe who were our Lords companions, and therefore deſpiſeth our Lord Chriſt, and likewiſe deſpiſeth the Father, and is condemned of himſelf, reſiſting and oppoſing his own ſalvation which all Hereticks do.* Can any thing be more plain, than that *Irenæus* makes it his deſign to reſolve *Faith* into the writings of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, and ſaith, That theſe writings were delivered as *a Foundation of Faith* that the *reaſon* why the *Chriſtians* believed but one *God* and one *Chriſt*, was, becauſe they read of no more in the *Goſpels* publiſhed by them, *That he that deſpiſeth them who were our Lords companions, deſpiſe himſelf and God, and condemn themſelves.* He doth not ſay, he that deſpiſeth the *lawfully ſent Paſtors of the Church meeting in General Councils, nor them who have power to oblige the Church to believe as well as the Apoſtles had*, as you ſay, but evidently makes the obligation to believe, to depend upon that *revelation* of *Gods will*, which was made by the *Apoſtles*, and is by their writings conveyed down to us. Would not the *Valentinians* have thought themſelves preſently run down by ſuch ways of confutation as yours are, that they muſt believe the *preſent Church infallible* in whatever is delivered to be believed to the world?

Quibus ſi quis non aſſentit, ſpernit quidem participes Domini, ſpernit autem & ipſum Chriſtum Dominum, ſpernit vero & Patrem, & eſt à ſemetipſo damnatus, reſiſtens & repugnans ſalati ſuæ, quod faciunt omnes hæretici. Iren. l. 3. c. 1.

But doth not *Irenæus* himſelf make uſe of the *Churches Tradition* as the great argument to confute them by? I grant he doth ſo, and it is on that very account *that he might confute them*, and not lay down the only ſure *Foundation* of *Chriſtian Faith*. For he gives that reaſon of his doing ſo in the beginning of the very next Chapter. *For*, (ſaith he) *when we diſpute againſt them out of the Scripture, they are turned preſently to an accuſing of the Scriptures as though they were not in all things right, and wanted Authority, and becauſe of their ambiguity, and for that truth cannot be found out by them without the help of Tradition.* I need not ſay, that *Irenæus* propheſied of you in this ſaying of his, but it is as true of you as if he had. Your pretences being the very *ſame*, againſt the *Scriptures* being the *rule* of *Faith*, with thoſe of the *Valentinians*; only that you deny not the *truth* of what is therein contained, for otherwiſe the *want of Authority in themſelves*, the *ambiguity of them*, the *impoſſibility of knowing the ſenſe of them without Tradition*, are the very ſame arguments which with the greateſt pomp and oſtentation are produced by you againſt the *Scriptures* being the *Rule* whereby to judge of *Controverſies*. Which we have no more cauſe to wonder at, than *Irenæus* had in the *Valentinians*, *becauſe from them we produce our greateſt arguments againſt your fond opinions.* Now when the *Valentinians* pretended their great *rule* was on *oral Tradition*, which was conveyed from the *Apoſtles* down to them; to this *Irenæus* oppoſeth the conſtant Tradition of the *Apoſtolical Churches*, which in a continued ſucceſſion was preſerved from the *Apoſtles times*, which was the ſame every where among all the *Churches*, which every one who deſired it, might eaſily be ſatisfied about; becauſe *they could number them, who by the Apoſtles were appointed Biſhops in Churches, and their ſucceſſors, unto our own times, who taught no ſuch thing, nor ever knew any ſuch thing as they madly fancy to themſelves.* We ſee then his *appeal* to *Tradition* was only in a matter of fact, Whether ever any ſuch thing as their opinion which was not contained in *Scripture*, was delivered to them, by the *Apoſtles* or no, *i. e.* Whether the *Apoſtles* left any

§. 5.

Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accuſationem convertuntur ipſarum Scripturarum, quaſi non rectè habeant, neq; ſint ex authoritate, & quia variè ſint dicta, & quia non poſſit ex his invenirì veritas ab his qui neſciant traditionem. Iren. l. 3. c. 2.

Et habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apoſtolis inſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi in Eccleſiis & ſucceſſores eorum uſq; ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neq; cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur. L. 3. c. 3.

oral Traditions in the *Churches* which ſhould be the rule to interpret *Scriptures* by, or no? And the whole deſign of *Irenæus* is to prove the contrary, by an appeal to all the *Apoſtolical Churches*, and particularly by appealing to the *Roman Church*, becauſe of its due fame and celebrity in that Age wherein *Irenæus* lived. So that *Irenæus* appealed to the then *Roman Church*, even when he ſpeaks higheſt in the honour of it, for ſomewhat which is fundamentally contrary to the *pretenſions* of the *now Roman Church*. He then appealed to it, for an evidence againſt ſuch *oral Traditions* which were pretended to be left by the *Apoſtles* as a rule to underſtand *Scripture* by; and, were it not for this ſame pretence now, what will become of the Authority of the *preſent Roman Church?*

After he hath thus manifeſted by recourſe to the *Apoſtolical Churches* that there was no ſuch *Tradition* left *among them*, it was very reaſonable to infer that there was *none ſuch at all*; for they could not imagine, if the *Apoſtles* had deſigned any ſuch *Tradition*, but they would have communicated it to thoſe famous *Churches* which were planted by them, and it was abſurd to ſuppoſe that thoſe *Churches* who could ſo eaſily derive their ſucceſſion from the *Apoſtles* ſhould in ſo ſhort a time have loſt the memory of ſo rich a treaſure depoſited with them, as that was pretended to be; from whence he ſufficiently refutes that unreaſonable imagination of the *Valentinians*. Which having done, he proceeds to ſettle thoſe firm *grounds* on which the *Chriſtians* believed in *one God the Father*, and in *one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, which he doth by removing the only *Objection* which the *Adverſaries* had againſt them. For when the *Chriſtians* declared, the main *reaſon* into which they reſolved their Faith as to theſe principles, was, *Becauſe* no other *God or Chriſt* were revealed in *Scripture*, but them whom they believed, the *Valentinians* anſwered, this could not be a ſufficient *foundation* for their *Faith* on this account, becauſe many things were delivered in *Scripture*, not according to the *truth of the things*, but the *judgement and opinion of the perſons they were ſpoken to*. This therefore being ſuch a *pretence* as would deſtroy any *firm reſolution of Faith into Scripture*, and muſt neceſſarily place it in *Tradition*; *Irenæus* concerns himſelf much to demonſtrate the *contrary*, by an *oſtenſion* (as he calls it) that *Chriſt and the Apoſtles did all along ſpeak according to truth, and not according to the opinion of their auditors*, which is the entire ſubject of the fifth *Chapter* of his third *Book*. Which he proves firſt of *Chriſt*, becauſe he was *Truth it ſelf*, and it would be very contrary to his nature to ſpeak of things otherwiſe than they were, when the very deſign of his coming was to direct men in the way of *Truth*. *The Apoſtles* were *perſons* who profeſſed to declare *truth* to the world, and as *light* cannot *communicate* with *darkneſs*, ſo neither could *truth* be *blinded* with ſo much *falſhood* as that opinion ſuppoſeth in them. And therefore neither *our Lord* nor his *Apoſtles* could be ſuppoſed to mean any other *God* or *Chriſt* than whom they declared. *For this* (ſaith he) *were rather to increaſe their ignorance and confirm them in it, than to cure them of it*; and therefore that Law was true which pronounced a *curſe on every one who led a blind man out of his way*. And the *Apoſtles* being ſent for the *recovery of the loſt ſight of the blind*, cannot be ſuppoſed to ſpeak to *men* according to their *preſent opinion*, but according to the *manifeſtation* of truth. For, what *Phyſician intending to cure a Patient, will do according to his Patients deſire, and not rather what will be beſt for him?* From whence he concludes, Since the *deſign of Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* was not to flatter but to cure mens ſouls; it follows, that they did not ſpeak to them, according to their former *opinion*, but according to *truth* without all *hypocriſie* and *diſſimulation*. From whence it follows, that if *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* did ſpeak according to truth, there is then need of no Oral Tradition for our underſtanding *Scripture*, and conſequently the reſolution of our

Faith

Faith as to *God and Chriſt*, and proportionably as to other objects to be believed, is not into any Tradition pretending to be derived from *the Apoſtles*, but into the *Scriptures themſelves*; which by this diſcourſe evidently appears to have been the *judgement* of *Irenæus*.

§. 6. The next which follows, is *Clemens* of *Alexandria* who flouriſhed *A. D.* 196. whom St. *Hierome* accounted the *moſt learned of all the writers of the Church*: and therefore cannot be ſuppoſed ignorant in ſo neceſſary a part of the *Chriſtian Doctrine* as the *Reſolution of Faith* is. And if his judgement may be taken, the *Scriptures* are the only certain *Foundation* of *Faith*; for in his *Admonition* to the *Gentiles* after he hath with a great deal of *excellent learning* derided the *Heathen Superſtitions*, when he comes to give an account of the *Chriſtians Faith*, he begins it with this pregnant Teſtimony to our purpoſe. *For* (ſaith he) *the Sacred Oracles affording us the moſt manifeſt grounds of Divine worſhip, are the Foundation of Truth.* And ſo goes on in a high commendation of the *Scripture*, as the moſt *compendious directions* for happineſs, the *beſt Inſtitutions* for *government of life*, the moſt *free* from all vain *ornaments*, that they *raiſe mens ſouls up out of wickedneſs, yielding the moſt excellent remedies, diſſwading from the greateſt deceit*, and moſt clearly *incouraging to a foreſeen happineſs*; with more of the ſame nature. And when after he perſwades men with ſo much *Rhetorick* and *earneſtneſs* to imbrace the *Scriptures* ἀναπεπλαμμέναις ταῖς ἀκοαῖς *with the greateſt readineſs*, he gives this as the reaſon of it, that ſo they might ἐν ἁγναῖς ξενοδοχεῖν ταῖς ψυχαῖς τ̀ Θεὸν, *entertain God in chaſte ſouls. For the Word is that light to men, by which we ſee God:* and ſoon after ſpeaking that the deſign of Religion is to make men *like to God as much as poſſible*, he adds, *That truly they are the Sacred Scriptures which make men Holy and Deifie men, i. e.* by Aſſimilation. And in that large and eloquent *Paræneſis* which follows, wherein he perſwades men to the forſaking their old cuſtoms and embracing *Chriſtianity*, all the arguments he uſeth are drawn from the *Scriptures*, and not ſo much as the leaſt mention of any *Infallible Enſurancer* of their *truth* and *authority*, but ſuppoſeth the *evidence* he produceth, *ſufficient* to perſwade them to the belief and love of them. In the firſt of his *Stromata*, he proves the *truth* of the *Scriptures* by the much greater *antiquity* of them than any of the *Greek learning*. In the *ſecond*, where he particularly enquires into the *nature and grounds of Faith*, he hath this expreſſion, *He therefore that believes the Sacred Scriptures, having a firm judgement doth receive the voyce of God who gave the Scriptures, as an impregnable demonſtration.* (Although the text be commonly Printed without the *comma* between ἔχων and ἀπόδειξιν, yet the ſenſe and context makes it evident that it ought to be there, and accordingly *Sylburgius* gives intimation of it in his *notes*, and *Gentian Hervet* in the tranſlation as reviſed by *Heinſius* applies the demonſtration to what follows, but very weakly joyns ἀναντίῤῥητον with κείσιν and not with ἀπόδειξιν, and ſo renders it *firmum habens judicium cui contradici nequit*, whereas it is plain that he intends to give an account what that foundation is, which *Faith* doth ſtand on.) And after having made a large diſcourſe concerning the *nature of Faith* comparing the judgement of *Philoſophers* concerning it, he concludes with this ſaying, *That it is an abſurd thing for the followers of Pythagoras to ſuppoſe that his* ipſe dixit *was inſtead of a demonſtration to them; and yet thoſe who are the lovers of truth not to believe the ſure teſtimony of our only Saviour and God, but to exact proofs of him of what he ſpake.* Wherein he diſcovers

Hieron. ep. ad Magnum.

Καὶ δὴ ὁι χρησμοὶ, τὰς εἰς τὸν Θεοσέβειαν ἡμῖν ἀφορμὰς εὐαρχέσατα προτείνοντες, ἡμεμνιῶσι τῶν ἀληθείαν. Clem. Alex. Προτρέπ. q. 50. ed. Pariſ.

Φῶς γὰρ ὁ λόγ@ ἀνθρώποις, δι' ὃ καταυγαζόμεθα τ̀ Θεόν. p. 55.

Ἱερὰ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς, τὰ ἱερογραφοῦντα καὶ θεοποιοῦντα γράμματα. p. 56.

Ὁ πιστεύσας τοίνυν ταῖς γραφαῖς ταῖς θείαις, τῷ κρίσιν βεβαίαν ἔχων, ἀπόδειξιν ἀναντίῤῥητον, τῷ τὰς γραφὰς διδόντι φωνῇ λαμβάνει θεῦ. Strom. 2. p. 362.

Τὰς δὲ τ̀ ἀληθείας τιλοθεάμονας, ἀπιστεῖν ἐπιχειροῦντας ἐξοπίσω διδασκάλῳ τῷ μένῳ Σωτῆρι Θεῷ, βατάνας τ̀ λεγομένων ἀπαιτεῖν παρ' αὐτ̀. p. 369.

vers

vers that *Chriſtianity* requires from men no unreaſonable thing in expecting aſſent where no ſuch kind of proofs as thoſe uſed by *Philoſophers* are; but if the *Epicureans* did ſuppoſe ſome kind of *anticipation* neceſſary to knowledge, if the *Pythagoreans* relyed on *Authority*, if *Heraclitus* quarrell'd with ſuch *as could neither hear nor ſpeak, i. e.* ſuch as neither had *Authority* themſelves, and yet would *rely* on none; it could not be judged any *abſurd* thing that *Chriſtianity* did require ſuch an *aſſent* to what *Chriſt* delivered, eſpecially conſidering that he was ἀξιόπιστος, *i. e.* that he diſcovered *ſufficient reaſon* why he was to be believed in whatever he ſpake. And thence elſewhere he ſays, *That Faith is a ſure demonſtration, becauſe truth follows whatever is delivered from God.* And when he gives an account what that *true knowledge* is which the *Chriſtian* hath, he ſhews what things are requiſite to it; two things *Knowledge* ſuppoſeth ζήτησις and ἔυρεσις, *enquiry and diſcovery*; the *Enquiry* (ſaith he) *is an impulſe of the mind for the finding out of ſomething by ſome ſigns which are proper to it*; *Diſcovery*, *is the end and reſt of enquiry, which lyes in the comprehenſion of the thing, which is properly Knowledge. Now the ſigns by which things are diſcovered, are either precedent, concomitant, or ſubſequent.* All theſe he thus applies to the *Scriptures*. *The diſcovery, as the end of our enquiry after God, is, the Doctrine delivered by his Son; but the ſigns whereby we know that he was the Son of God, precedent, are the Prophecies declaring his coming; concomitant, were the Teſtimonies concerning his birth: ſubſequent, are thoſe Miracles, which were publiſhed, and manifeſtly ſhewed to the world after his Aſcenſion. Therefore the peculiar evidence that the truth is with us, is, that the Son of God himſelf hath taught us.*

Γίνεται τοίνυν αὕτη ἡ πίστεως πρόσληψις βεβαία, ἐπὶ τοιούτῳ τῷ θεοῦ παραδοθεῖσιν ἡ ἀλήθεια ἕπεται. Strom. 6. p. 649.

Τῆς τοίνυν περὶ θεοῦ ζητήσεως, ἀφέσεως δὲ ἡ διὰ τῶν υἱῶν διδασκαλία· σημεῖον δὲ τοῦ ζητοῦντος τὸν Σωτῆρα ἡμῶν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, αἵ τε προηγόρευται παρουσίαι αὐτοῦ προφητεῖαι, τά τε τὸν κηρύξαντα καὶ τὸν συνπαραξάντα τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτοῦ τῇ αἰδίῳ περὶ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίαι· πρὸς δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν κηρυσσόμεναί τε καὶ ἐμφανεῖς δεικνύμεναι δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ τεκμήριον ἀφ' ὧν παρ' ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τὸ αὐτὸν διδάξαι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. Strom. 6. p. 674.

A place not ſo clear in it ſelf, as miſerably involved through the oſcitancy of the *Latin Interpreter*, in which it is plain, that *Clemens* doth exactly, according to all *rational principles* of *knowledge*, give an account of the *grounds* of *Chriſtian Faith*; the main principle of which, is, the *doctrine delivered by Chriſt*; which, that it ought to be aſſented to, appears by a full *concurrence* of all thoſe *ſigns* which are neceſſary in *enquiries*; here are the greateſt *precedent ſigns* (*Prophecies*, made ſo long before, exactly accompliſhed in him) the *fulleſt concomitant ſigns* (in the many *wonderful things* which happened at his coming in the world) and the cleareſt *ſubſequent ſigns* by thoſe great and uncontrouled *miracles*, which were wrought in the world after his *Aſcenſion*; *all which put together do evidently prove that he was the Son of God who delivered this doctrine to us, and therefore deſerves our moſt firm aſſent in whatever appears to be his Word.* Can any thing then be more apparent than his *reſolution of Faith* into the *rational evidence* of *Chriſts being* the *Son of God*, which is manifeſted to us not by the *Infallible teſtimony* of any *Church*, but by the *Infallible ſigns* of it which were *precedent* to, *attendant* on, and *conſequent* to his appearance in the world. *If therefore* (ſaith he) *according to* Plato, *truth can only be learned, either from God, or thoſe who are come from him, we may juſtly boaſt that we learn the truth from the Son of God, taking the Teſtimonies out of thoſe Sacred Oracles, which were firſt Propheſied and then fully declared, viz.* by accompliſhment. The main ground of *Faith* then, is ſuch as the wiſeſt *Philoſophers* did admit of, viz. *that whatſoever God ſaid is true*, and none can deliver *truth* but ſuch as come from him, on which account there is nothing left, but *evidence* that he in whom we believe was the *Son of God*, which is abundantly manifeſted

Εἴπερ οὖν καὶ κατὰ Πλάτωνα, ἢ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ παρὰ τοῦ ἐκγόνου τοῦ θεοῦ. τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐκμανθάνειν μόνως, ὅτι τε εἰκότως παρὰ τοῦ θείου λογίου τὰ μαρτύρια ἐκλεγόμενοι, τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐχήσομεν ἐκμεμαθηκέναι, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὰ θεῖα, προφητευθέντα μὲν τὸ πρῶτον, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ σαφηνισθέντα. p. 675.

nifeſted by the *accompliſhment of thoſe Prophecies* in him which were made ſo long before. After which he diſputes againſt the ſame ſort of *Heretick*s which *Irenæus* did, and upon the *ſame principles*, viz. *that whatever God or Chriſt thought neceſſary for us to know or believe, is conſigned to us in the writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles*; *and thence he cites that out of* Peters κήρυγμα (a Book I ſuppoſe then extant under that name) *nothing without the written word*, where was the unwritten word then? And in that end of the *Book* diſcovers the *weakneſs of Philoſophy*, becauſe it came *from meer men*; *but men, as men, are no ſufficient teachers when they ſpeak concerning* God. *For* (ſaith he) *man cannot ſpeak* ἀξιοχρέως *things becoming* God; *for being weak and mortal he cannot ſpeak as he ought of a Being infinite and immortal, nor he that is the work of him who made it; beſides he that cannot ſpeak truth concerning Himſelf, how much leſs is he to be believed concerning* God? *For as much as man wants of Divine power, ſo much muſt his ſpeech fall ſhort of* God, *when he diſcourſeth of him. For mans ſpeech is naturally weak and unable to expreſs* God; *not only as to his eſſence, but as to his power and works*; *thence he concludes a neceſſity that* God *by his Spirit muſt diſcover himſelf to men, which revelation he proves to be only extant among Chriſtians*, becauſe of the many *Divine teſtimonies* that *Chriſt was the Son of* God, becauſe the *knowledge* that came by him was ſo *remarkably diſperſed abroad in the world*, and did prevail, notwithſtanding all *oppoſition and perſecution. For* (ſaith he) *the Greek Philoſophy if any ordinary Magiſtrate forbid it did preſently ſink; but our doctrine hath been forbid from its firſt publiſhing, by the Kings and Potentates of the earth, who have uſed their utmoſt induſtry to deſtroy both us and that together, but ſtill it flouriſheth, and the more for its being perſecuted*; *for it dyes not like a humane doctrine, nor periſheth like a weak gift.* Thus we ſee that he inſiſts on *rational evidence* as the great and ſufficient teſtimony into which our *Faith is reſolved* as to the being of a *Divine Revelation.*

P. 676, 678. &c.

Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐχέγγυοι διδάσκαλοι περὶ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, καθὸ ἄνθρωποι. p. 697.

Ἀσθενὴς γὰρ φύσει ὁ ἀνθρώπειος λόγος, καὶ ἀδύνατος φράσαι θεόν. Id. ib.

Ἡ δὲ μᾶλλον ἀνθεῖ· καὶ ὡς ἀνθρωπίνη ἀποδυσωπεῖ διδασκαλία, οὐδ' ὡς ἀσθενὲς μισεῖται δῶρον. p. 698.

In his next *Book* he anſwers ſome objections of the *Heathens* againſt *believing Chriſtianity*, of which the chiefeſt was, the *diſſenſion* among the *Chriſtians*, wherein (if ever) he had an opportunity to declare what the certain *rule of Faith* is, and what power *God* hath left his *Church* for determining matters to be believed by us. But for want of underſtanding this *neceſſary foundation of Faith*, viz. *the Churches Infallibility*, he is fain to anſwer this objection juſt as a *Proteſtant* would do. 1. *If this were an argument againſt truth, the objectors had none themſelves, for both Jews and Greeks had hereſies among them.* 2. *The very coming of hereſies was an argument of the truth of Scripture, becauſe that had expreſly foretold them.* 3. *This argument doth not hold any where elſe, therefore it ſhould not in reaſon here*, viz. *where there is any diſſent there can be no certainty*; for though *Phyſicians differ much from one another, yet Patients are not thereby diſcouraged from ſeeking to them for cure.* 4. *This ſhould only make men uſe more care and diligence in the ſearch and enquiry after truth*; *for they will find abundant recompence for their ſearch in the pleaſure of finding truth. Would any one ſay, becauſe two apples are offered to him, the one a real fruit, the other made of wax, that therefore he will meddle with neither*; *but rather that he ought to uſe more care to diſtinguiſh the one from the other? If there be but one high way and many by-paths which lead to precipices, rivers, or the Sea, Will he not go in the high way becauſe there are ſuch falſe ones? but rather go in it with the more care, and get the exacteſt knowledge of it he can. Doth a Gardener caſt off the care of his Garden becauſe weeds grow up with his herbs? or rather, doth he not uſe the more diligence to diſtinguiſh one from the other? So ought we to do in diſcerning truth.* 5. *That all thoſe who*

P. 753, &c.

who seriously enquire after truth may receive satisfaction. For either mans mind is capable of evidence, or it is not; if not, it is to no purpose to trouble our selves with any thing of knowledge at all; if it be, then we must descend to particular questions, by which we may demonstratively learn from the Scriptures how the heresies fell off from them: and that the most exact knowledge is preserved in truth alone, and the ancient Church. If then *Heresies* must be demonstratively confuted out of *Scriptures*, what then doth he make to be the *rule* to judge of *Controversies*, but only *them*? For what he speaks of the *ancient Church*, he speaks of it as in conjunction with *truth*, and in opposition to those *novel Heresies* of the *Basilidians* and *Valentinians*. For, that he doth not at all appeal to the judgement of any *Church* much less the *present*, as having any *infallibility* whereon men ought to rely in matters of Faith, appears likewise by his following words. *But those* (saith he) *who are willing to imploy themselves in the most excellent things, will never give over the search of truth, till they have received a demonstration of it from the Scriptures themselves.* Here we see, *the last resolution of assent*, is into the *Scriptures themselves*, without any the least mention or intimation of any *Infallibility* in the *Church*, either to deliver, or interpret those *Scriptures* to us: And after, gives the true account of Heresies, *viz. mens not adhering to the Scriptures. For* (saith he) *they must necessarily be deceived in the greatest things who undertake them, unless they hold fast the Rule of Truth, which they received from Truth it self.* And in this following discourse he goes as high as any *Protestants* whatever (even such who suppose the *Scripture* to be *principium indemonstrabile*, by any thing but it self) for he makes the *Doctrine delivered by Christ, to be the Principle of our Faith, and we make use of it* (saith he) *to be our* κριτήριον *to find out other things by. But, whatever is judged, is not believed till it be judged, therefore that can be no Principle which stands in need of being judged. Justly therefore when we have by Faith received that indemonstrable Principle, and from the Principle it self used demonstrations concerning it self, we are by the voice of our Lord instructed in the knowledge of Truth.* Nothing can be more plain in what he saith, than that, if there were a higher κριτήριον than *Scripture* (as there must be, if we are to receive it on the account of the *Churches Infallible Testimony*) the *Scripture* could not be call'd the *Principle of our Faith*, but when we receive the *Scripture*, the evidence we have that it is our *Principle* must be fetched *from it self*; and therefore he does here in terms (as expres as may be) *resolve the belief of Scripture into internal arguments*, and makes it as much a *Principle supposed* as ever his Lordship doth. And immediately after, when he proposeth that very Question, *How this should be proved to others, We expect not* (saith he) *any proof from men, but we prove the thing sought for by the Word of God, which is more worthy belief than any demonstration, or rather which is the only demonstration, by the knowledge of which, those who have tasted of the Scripture alone become believers.* Can any one who reads these words ever imagine, that this man speaks like one, that said, That the *Scriptures of themselves appear no more to be Gods Word, than distinction of colours to a blind man?* How much beyond the *Valentinians*, and *Basilidians* would *Clemens* have accounted so great a *madness*? who so plainly asserts the *Scriptures to be proved by themselves*,

Ἀποδείξεως δ' ἧκιστα ἀνάγκη συγκαταβαίνειν εἰ τὰς ζητήσεις, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν σημαίνειν σαφέστερον ὅπως ἂν ἀπορρήσαιεν αἱ αἱρέσεις, &c. p. 755.

Ἀλλ' οἱ πονεῖν ἕτοιμοι ἐπὶ τοῖς κρείττοσιν, μέχρι τέλους ἀποστήσονται ζητοῦντες ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῶν γραφῶν, πρὶν ἂν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἀπὸ τῶν λάβωσιν αὐτῶν γραφῶν. Id. ib.

Σφάλλεσθαι δὲ ἀνάγκη μέγιστα τοῖς μεγίστοις ἐγχειροῦσι πράγμασιν, ἂν μὴ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας παρ' αὐτῆς λαβόντες ἔχωσι τῆς ἀληθείας. Id. p. 756.

Τὸ κρινόμενον δὲ πᾶν ἔτι ἄπιστον πρὶν κριθῆναι· ὡς τ' οὐδ' ἀρχὴ τὸ κρίσεως δεόμενον· εἰκότως τοίνυν πίστει βεβαιούντες ἀναπόδεικτον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ παιδείας, καὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις παρ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρχῆς περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς λαβόντες, φωνῇ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα πρὸς τὴν ἐπιγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας. Strom. 7. p. 757.

Οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου φωνὴν τὴν μετὰ τοῦ ζητουμένου· ἣ πασῶν ἀποδείξεων ἐστὶ γνωστικωτέρα, καὶ μᾶλλον δέ, ἡ μόνη πίστις ἐξ ἧς ὁ τυχὼν αἴρεται· καθ' ἣν ἐπιστήμονες οἱ ἐκ μόνων τῶν γραφῶν πιστοί. Ibid.

how much beyond the *Valentinians*, and *Basilidians* would *Clemens* have accounted so great a *madness*? who so plainly asserts the *Scriptures to be proved by themselves*,

ſelves, and that not *caſually*, or in the *heat of argument*; But leſt we ſhould not throughly apprehend his meaning repeats it again in the ſame page, ἀπ' αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῶν τῆς γραφῆς τελείως ἐπιδεικνύντες, *perfectly demonſtrating the Scriptures by themſelves*. And are not all theſe Teſtimonies of ſuch perſons ſo near the *Apoſtolical times*, ſufficient to acquaint us what the *grounds* of the *Reſolution of Faith* were in the *Chriſtian Church*? when all of them do ſo unanimouſly fix on the *Scripture*, and not ſo much as mention the *Infallible Teſtimonies* of any *Church*, much leſs the *Roman*. Much more might be cited out of this *excellent Author* to the ſame purpoſe, particularly where he refutes the *Valentinians*, who deſerted the *Scriptures*, and pleaded *Tradition*: but the Teſtimonies already produced are ſo plain, that it will be to no purpoſe to produce any more.

§. 7. It were eaſie to continue an account of the *ſame grounds of Faith*, through the ſucceeding *Writers* of the *Chriſtian Church*, who have deſignedly writ on that ſubject, in vindication of *Chriſtian Religion*, which they unanimouſly prove to be *Divine*, chiefly by theſe *Arguments*; from the *undoubted Miracles* which were wrought by *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*, from the *exact fulfilling of Prophecies*, and the *admirable propagation* of the *Chriſtian Doctrine*; all which are particularly inſiſted on by *Origen* againſt *Celſus*; by *Tertullian*, in his *Apologetick*, *adverſus Scapulam*, and elſewhere; by *Minucius Felix*, *Arnobius*, and *Lactantius*; not to mention *Euſebius* in his *Books* of *preparation* and *demonſtration Evangelical*; *Cyril*'s Anſwer to *Julian* and others. (But, having elſewhere more fully and largely conſidered that ſubject, I rather chuſe to refer the Reader to what hath been there handled already, than to tire his patience with either repeating the ſame, or adding more Teſtimonies to the ſame purpoſe.) Only that which is moſt pertinent to our preſent purpoſe, I ſhall here add, Whether is it credible that thoſe *perſons* who fully underſtood the *Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity*, who were themſelves *rational* and *inquiſitive* men, and writ for the ſatisfaction not only of *ſubtle adverſaries*, but of *doubting and ſtaggering Chriſtians*, ſhould ſo unanimouſly agree in inſiſting on the *evidence* of *matter* of *fact*, for the *truth* of the thing delivered in *Scripture*, and the fore-mentioned *Arguments* for the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine* therein delivered, had it not been the judgement of the *Church* they lived in, that the *reſolution of Faith* was into thoſe grounds on which they inſiſted? And is it again credible, that any of them ſhould *believe* the *Teſtimony* of the *Church* to be neceſſary as *infallible*, in order to a *Divine Faith*, and that without it, the *Scriptures* could not be believed as *Divine*, and yet in all their *diſputes* with the *Gentiles* concerning the *Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity*, and with ſeveral *Hereticks* (as the *Marcioniſts*, *&c.*) concerning the *Books* of *Scripture*, upon no occaſion ſhould mention this grand *Palladium* of *Faith*, *viz.* the *Infallibility* of the *preſent Church*? And *laſtly*, Is it credible, that when in our modern *Controverſies* men do evidently maintain *faction* and *intereſt*, more than the *common Principles* of *Chriſtianity* (that he muſt be *blinder* than *one that can ſee no diſtinction of colours*, that doth not diſcern on what account this *Infallibility* is now pretended) Is it, I ſay, credible, that a *Doctrine* pretended ſo neceſſary for our believing *Scriptures* with *Divine Faith*, ſhould be ſo concealed; when it ought, for the *honour* and *intereſt* of *Chriſtianity*, to have been moſt divulged? Which now only in theſe *laſt* and *worſt times* is challenged by an *uſurping party* in the *Church* as left by *Chriſt himſelf* (when no other evidence can be given of it, but what was common to all *ages* of the *Church*) as belonging to ſuch a party under the pretence of the *Catholick Church*, which doth ſo apparently uſe it only to uphold her pretended *Authority*, and ſo makes it ſerve to the worſt ends, and the moſt unworthy deſigns.

Origines ſacræ l. 2. c. 7, 8, 9, 10.

Having thus far conſidered what the judgement of thoſe *Fathers* was concerning the *reſolution of Faith*, who lived neareſt the *Apoſtolical times*; I ſhould now come to conſider what you can produce out of *Antiquity*, for your *Churches Infallibility*, or more generally, *for any infallible Teſtimony* ſuppoſed in the *Catholick Church* (whatever that be) in order to a Foundation for *Divine Faith*: But you very prudently avoid the *Teſtimonies* of *Antiquity* in ſo neceſſary a *ſubject* as this is; for, thoſe *Teſtimonies* mentioned in the foregoing *Chapter*, in explication of *Matth.* 28. 20. taking them, as you have in ſo looſe and careleſs a manner produced them, make nothing at all for the *Churches Infallible Teſtimony*; but only aſſert that which is not denied, that there ſhall always be a *Chriſtian Church* in the world. Our only remaining task then, as to this, is, to examine in what way you ſeek to enervate the Teſtimonies produced by his Lordſhip out of *Antiquity*, which you do in
P. 10. n. 32. the latter part of *Chap.* 8. His Lordſhip had truly ſaid, *That this method and manner of proving the Scripture to be the Word of God, which he uſeth, is the ſame which the ancient Church ever held, namely Tradition, or Eccleſiaſtical Authority firſt, and then all other arguments, but eſpecially internal from the Scripture it ſelf.* For which he cites, firſt, *The Church in S.* Auguſtine's *time. He was no enemy to Church-Tradition* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *yet when he would prove that the Author of the Scripture* (*and ſo of the whole knowledge of Divinity, as it is ſupernatural*) *is God in Chriſt, he takes this as the all-ſufficient way, and gives four proofs all internal to the Scripture.* 1. *The Miracles.* 2. *That there is nothing carnal in the Doctrine.* 3. *That there hath been ſuch performance of it.* 4. *That by ſuch a Doctrine of Humility, the whole world almoſt hath been converted. And whereas* ad muniendam fidem, *for the defending of the Faith, and keeping it entire, there are two things requiſite, Scripture and Church-Tradition*; Vincent. Lirinenſ. *places authority of Scriptures firſt, and then Tradition. And ſince it is apparent, that Tradition is firſt in order of time, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that Scripture is firſt in order of nature, that is the chief upon which Faith reſts and reſolves it ſelf.* To this, (after you have needleſly explained his Lordſhips opinion in this Con-
P. 102. troverſie) you begin to anſwer thus; *He cites firſt* Vincentius Lirinenſis, *l.* 1. *c.* 1. *who makes our Faith to be confirmed both by Scripture and Tradition of the Catholick Church.* But, Are not you like to be truſted in citing *Fathers* who doubly falſifie a Teſtimony of your adverſaries, when you may be ſo eaſily diſproved? For 1. You tell us, he cites that *firſt*, which he produceth *laſt*. 2. You cite that as produced by him for the *Foundation of Faith*, which he expreſly cites for the *preſervation* of the *Doctrine* of *Faith*; ſo he tells you *ad muniendam fidem, &c.* Can any thing be more plain and obvious to any one who looks into that diſcourſe of *Vincentius*, than that he makes it not his buſineſs to give an account of the *general Foundations* of Faith as to the *Scriptures* being *Gods Word*, but of the particular *Doctrines* of *Faith*, in oppoſition to the *Hereſies* which ariſe in the *Church*. So that all that he ſpeaks concerning *Scripture*, is not about the *authority*, but the *ſenſe* and *interpretation* of it. If therefore I ſhould grant you, that he ſpeaks of *Chriſtian* and *Divine Faith*, What is this to your purpoſe, unleſs you could prove that he ſpeaks of that *Divine Faith*, whereby we believe the *Scripture to be the Word of God.* But yet your argument is very good to prove, *that he ſpeaks not of any humane fallible perſwaſion, but true Chriſtian Divine Faith; for he oppoſes it to Hereſie, and calls it ſound Faith, and his Faith.* It ſeems then, whatever *Faith* is *ſound* for the *matter* of it, is preſently *Chriſtian, Divine, and Infallible*; and ſo, whoſoever believes any thing which is materially *true*, in oppoſition to *Hereſies*, needs never fear as long as he doth ſo, for according to you he hath *Chriſtian and Infallible Faith*; but, what if the *Devils Faith* be as

ſound

ſound as any *Catholick's*, Muſt it therefore be *Divine Faith? No* (it may be you will anſwer) *becauſe he wants the formal object of Faith, and doth not believe on the account of your Churches Infallibility*; I verily believe you; for he knows the *juglings* of it too much to believe it *infallible*. But, take *Vincentius* in what ſenſe you pleaſe, that is evident in him which his Lordſhip produced him for, that, *for the preſerving Faith entire*, he places authority of *Scripture* firſt, and then *Tradition* (unleſs you will ſerve his Teſtimony, as you do his Lordſhips, becauſe it makes for your purpoſe, ſay, He mentions *Tradition firſt*, and then *Scripture*) but, ſay you, *He ſays Tradition doth as truly confirm Divine Faith, as Scripture, though Scripture doth it in a higher manner*. If you did but conſider, either what kind of *Tradition*, or what kind of *Faith Vincentius* inſiſts on, you could not poſſibly think his words any thing to your purpoſe. For he ſpeaks not of any *Tradition infallibly atteſted* to us, without which you pretend there can be no *Divine Faith*, but of ſuch an *Univerſal Tradition* which depends wholly upon *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent*, and never ſo much as mentions, much leſs pretends to any thing of *Infallibility*: So that if you grant ſuch a kind of *Tradition*, doth as truly confirm *Faith* as the *Scripture*, then you muſt grant no neceſſity of an *Infallible Teſtimony* to aſſure us of that *Tradition*, for *Vincentius* ſpeaks of ſuch a kind of *Tradition*, as hath no connexion with *Infallibility*. For if *Vincentius* had ever in the leaſt thought of any ſuch thing, ſo great and zealous an oppoſer of *Hereſies* would not have left out that which had been more to his purpoſe, than all that he had ſaid. For wiſe men, who have throughly conſidered of *Vincentius* his way, though in general they cannot but approve of it ſo far as to think it highly improbable, that there ſhould be *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent* againſt the true and genuine ſenſe of *Scripture*, yet when they conſider this way of *Vincentius*, with all thoſe *cautions*, *reſtrictions*, and *limitations* ſet down by him (*l.* 1. *c.* 39.) they are apt to think, that he hath put men to a *wild-gooſe-chaſe* to find out any thing according to his Rules; and that S. *Auguſtine* ſpake a great deal more to the purpoſe, when he ſpake concerning all the *Writers of the Church*; *That although they had never ſo much learning and ſanctity, he did not think it true, becauſe they thought ſo, but becauſe they perſwaded him to believe it true, either from the Authority of Scripture, or ſome probable Reaſon.* If therefore S. *Auſtin's* Authority be not ſunk ſo low as that of the *Monk* of *Lerins*, we have very little reaſon to think that *Tradition* can as truly confirm Faith to us as the *Scriptures*, ſuppoſing that to have been the meaning of *Vincentius*. Which yet is not reaſonable to imagine, ſince *Vincentius* himſelf grants, that in caſe of *inveterate Hereſie* or *Schiſm*, either the ſole *Authority* of *Scripture* is to be uſed, or at moſt the *determinations* of *General Councils*; nay, and in all caſes doth ſuppoſe, that the *Canon of Scripture is perfect, and is abundantly ſufficient of it ſelf for all things*. Can you yet therefore ſuppoſe, *that Vincentius did think that Tradition did as truly confirm our Faith as the Scripture?* Which is your aſſertion, and the only thing whereby you pretend *that the Biſhop hath miſconſtrued* Vincentius; but whether be more guilty of it, I leave to impartial judgement.

Alios autem ita lego, ut quantâlibet ſanctitate, doctrinâq; præpolleant, non ideò verum putem, quia ipſi ita ſenſerunt, ſed quia mihi, vel per illos authores Canonicos, vel probabili ratione, quod à vero non abhorreat, perſuadere potuêrunt. Auguſt. ep. 19.

Quum ſit perfectus Scripturarum Canon, ſibiq; ad omnia ſatis ſuperq; ſufficiat, &c. l. 1. c. 2.

Lib. 1. c. 39.

§. 9.

The next Teſtimony you conſider, is, that of *Henricus à Gandavo*. For his Lordſhip had ſaid, *That the School had confeſſed, this was the way ever*. For which he cites the Teſtimony of that *Schoolman*, *That daily with them that are without, Chriſt enters by the woman*, i. e. *the Church, and they believe by that fame which ſhe gives* (alluding to the ſtory of the woman of *Samaria*.) *But*

Sic quotidie apud illos qui foris ſunt intrat Chriſtus per mulierem, in Eccleſiam, & credunt per iſtam famam, &c. Hen. à Gand. ſum. p. 1. *A.* 10. q. 1.

when they come to hear Christ himself, they believe His words before the words of the woman: *For when they have once found Christ, they do more believe his words in Scripture, than they do the Church, which testifies of him; because then* propter illam, *for the Scripture they believe the Church. And if the Church should speak contrary to the Scripture, they would not believe it. Thus* (saith his Lordship) *the School taught then. No, that did it not* (say you.) But let us see, how rarely you prove it: *For* (you say) *he speaks all this of a supernatural and Divine Faith to be given, both to the Scriptures, and the Church:* *Gandavensis* certainly is much obliged to you, who venture to speak such *great Absurdities* for his sake; for if he be understood in both places of *Divine* and *Infallible Faith*, these rare consequences follow. 1. That the *first beginning* of *Faith* is *equal* to the highest *degree* of it; for when he speaks of the *Church*, he speaks of *Christs entring by that*, which can be meant of nothing else but the *first step to Faith*, as is plain in the parallel case of the woman of *Samaria*; but if this were *Divine and Infallible*, it must be *equal* to the highest *degree*, for that I suppose can *be but Divine and Infallible*, unless you can find out *degrees* in *Infallibility*. By this Rule, you make him that is but over the *threshold*, as much in *the house*, as he that is *sate down* to the *Table*; a *plant* at its first *peeping* out of the earth, to be as *tall* as at its full growth; and the *Samaritans* as firmly to *believe* in Christ at the first *mention* of him by the *Woman*, as when they saw and heard him. 2. By this you make an *Infallible Faith* to be built on a *Fallible Testimony*; for to what purpose else was the Similitude of the *Woman* of *Samaria* insisted on, but to parallel the Testimony of the *Church* with that of the *Woman*, and consequently the *Faith* built on the *Churches* Testimony to be like that which the *Samaritans* had of *Christ* upon the *Womans Testimony*; and if you believe that *Faith Infallible*, you must assert, an *Infallible Faith* to be built on a *fallible Testimony*, and yet to be as *infallible*, as that which is built on an *Infallible Testimony*: And then, I pray, tell me, To what end would you make your *Churches Testimony Infallible*, if *Faith* may be *infallible* without it?

Plus verbis Christi in Scripturâ credit, quam Ecclesiæ testificanti: quia propter illam jam credit Ecclesiæ. Et, si ipsa quidem contraria Scripturæ diceret, ipsi non crederet. Id.

p 103. But, it may be, though these seem hard things, yet you prove them invincibly: No doubt of it; for, you say, *That Christ enters by that Faith, but Christ cannot enter into a soul by a meer humane fallible persuasion, but by Divine Faith only. Nay, when he says, That he more believes the Scripture, than the Churches Testimony, he saith, That he believes the Church; But how can he believe without Faith?* O the irresistible force of demonstrations! But what silly people are we, that thought a man might *enter* into a *house* by the *door*, though he met not with his hearty entertainment till afterwards? But, Do you really think, that *Christ* never *enters* into a *soul*, but by *Divine and Infallible Faith?* For *Christ enters* by that which gives him his *first admission*, but his *full reception* must be by a higher *degree* of *Faith*. Do you think men believe as much at *first* as ever after? If not, May not *Christ* be said to *enter* by that *lower degree of Faith?* I pray, What think you of the *case* in hand, Did not the belief of *Christ enter* by the *Woman* of *Samaria?* and was that, as *Divine a Faith*, as what they had afterwards? Nay, take *Christs entring* (as improperly as you can imagine it) for his *hearty reception* in the soul, Can that be no other ways but by an *Infallible Faith?* A *Faith* supposed to be built on *infallible grounds*, I grant; but whether all, who do truly *believe* in *Christ*, do build their *Faith* on *grounds in themselves infallible*, my charity to some deluded souls in your *Church* (as well as honest, but ignorant persons elsewhere) gives me just *reason* to question. But still there is a greater subtilty behind, which is, if he believes the *Scripture* more than the *Church*, then he must believe the *Church* equally with

with the *Scripture*; for that muſt be the meaning of what you ſay, *when he ſays, He believes the Scripture more than the Church, he believes the Church; but how can he believe without Faith? Ergo*, this muſt be Divine Faith, or elſe all the reſt come to nothing. So that if I ſay, *I believe the Scripture more than you*, it follows, that *I believe you as much as the Scripture*, by the very ſame conſequence. But you have gotten ſuch a knack of contradicting your ſelf, that poor *Gandavo* cannot fall into your hands, but you muſt make him do ſo too. When you ſay, *A man cannot believe without Faith*, I dare juſtifie it to be one of the greateſt truths in your Book; but, if your meaning be, *A man cannot believe without Divine Faith*, I hope we *Proteſtants* ſufficiently confute that; for you dare not deny that *we believe at all*, but (juſt as the *Devils* do) we muſt (according to you) *believe and tremble*, becauſe our Faith is not *Divine* and *Infallible*. But ſtill your ſubtilty works with you, for becauſe *Gandavenſis* ſaith, *That we muſt yield our firſt Faith to the Scripture, but* ſecundam ſub iſta, *a ſecondary Faith to the definitions and cuſtoms of the Catholick Church*: You cry out, *Here's* prima & ſecunda fides; *but yet both of them are properly and truly Faith.* But, Are both of them properly and truly *Divine Faith?* if ſo, How comes the diſtinction of the *firſt and ſecond*, one ſubordinate to the other, if both be *equally Divine and Infallible?* Nay, according to your Principles, the Faith given to the *Church* muſt be the *firſt Faith*, and to the *Scriptures the ſecond* under that; becauſe, for the ſake of the *Churches Teſtimony*, we are to believe the *Scriptures*. And, Do you really think, there may be no diſcovery of *Infidelity* in rejecting a *ſufficient Teſtimony* for *Faith*, where there is not an *Infallible Teſtimony?* But, whatever you think, your great enemy, *Reaſon*, tells us the contrary; and therefore what follows *of believing the Church, ſub pœnâ perfidiæ*, is to no more purpoſe than what went before. The ſtrength therefore of all that you ſay as to this Teſtimony of *Gandavenſis*, lyes in the proof of this one thing; *That no man can believe any thing without an Infallible Faith*; yet I *verily believe* that you have miſerably perverted the *Schoolmens* words, and think no more *Infallible Teſtimony* requiſite for it, than your *own words*.

But, it may be, though you do ſo ill by the *Schoolmen*, you may uſe the *Fathers* more civilly. Three things therefore you have to anſwer to thoſe Teſtimonies of the *Fathers*, which ſeem moſt to make uſe of internal Arguments. 1. *That they uſe them not to ſuch as had no Divine Faith, but to ſuch as had.* 2. *That they do not uſe them as Primary, Infallible and Divine proofs, but as ſecondary arguments, perſwaſive only to ſuch as believed Scripture to be Gods Word antecedently to them.* 3. *That they do not uſe only ſuch proofs as are wholly internal to the Scripture it ſelf. As to the two firſt conditions, you ſay 'tis evident, theſe proofs were made by Chriſtians, namely the Holy Fathers; and commonly to Chriſtians, who lived in their times. And as clear is it, that they never pronounced them to be the Primary, Infallible and Divine Motives of their belief in that point, nor uſed they them as ſuch.* How falſe and abſurd theſe Anſwers are, may appear by our precedent diſcourſe, wherein we manifeſted, that the *Chriſtians* inſiſted on thoſe *arguments* there mentioned not *for themſelves* and other *Chriſtians*, but chiefly to convince and perſwade by them the *Gentile world* to the belief of *Chriſtianity*. And, Did they ſuppoſe theſe *Heathens* to have a *Divine Faith* already? Or, Did they look on ſuch arguments as only *ſecondary motives*, when theſe were the *chief*, nay only *arguments* which they uſed to perſwade them; if they had other that were *Primary, Divine*, and *Infallible*, and only made uſe of *ſecondary, humane, probable motives*, they were guilty of the higheſt *betraying* the *Chriſtian Cauſe* imaginable. And you make them only to *defend Chriſtianity*, as *Vaninus* did *Divine Providence* with ſuch ſilly and weak arguments, that by

§. 10. P. 109.

their

their overthrow, the belief of it might fall with them. Indeed, if they had pretended the *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *Church*, there might have been juſt reaſon for ſuch a *Suſpicion*, and any wiſe men would have thought their deſign had been to make their Religion contemptible, and expoſe it to the deriſion of *Atheiſts*, inſtead of better eſtabliſhing the *Foundations* of believing it. But thoſe wiſe and holy men knew better the *intereſt* of *Chriſtianity*, than to offer to defend it by *Principles* in themſelves falſe, and much more liable to queſtion than that was which they were to prove by them: and therefore made choice of arguments in themſelves *ſtrong* and *evident*, and built on *Principles*, *common to themſelves, and thoſe whom they diſputed againſt*, *i. e.* they urged them with the greateſt ſtrength of *Reaſon*, and the cleareſt *evidence* of *Divine Revelation*, and never queſtioned but that a *Faith* built on thoſe *grounds*, if effectual for a *holy Life*, was a *true and Divine Faith*. It ſeems then, your cauſe cannot be maintained, without the moſt ſharp and virulent reflections on thoſe *Primitive Chriſtians*, who among all thoſe arguments whereby they ſo ſucceſsfully prevailed over the *Gentile world*, never did ſo much as vouchſafe to mention the leaſt pretence to *Infallibility*; for which they are now accuſed of uſing only the *blunter weapons*, of *humane and fallible motives*, and not thoſe *Primary* and *Divine Motives of Infallibility*. But this is not the firſt time we have ſeen, what deſperate ſhifts a bad cauſe puts men upon.

It may be yet, your ſtrength may lye in your *laſt condition*, *viz. That theſe arguments uſed by them, were not internal.* For, 1. You ſay, *That of* p. 109. *Miracles is external; the Scriptures themſelves work none, neither were ever any Miracles wrought to confirm, that all the Books now in the Canon* (*and no more*) *are the Word of God.* I anſwer, 1. I have already told you of a double reſolution of *Faith*, the one as to the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*, the other as to the *Veracity* of the *Books* which contain it: when therefore *Miracles* are inſiſted on, it is not in order to the *latter* of theſe which we have ſufficient aſſurance of without them, as I have already largely proved, both as to the *Truth* and *Integrity* of the *Canon* of *Scripture*; but *Miracles*, we ſay, are the arguments to prove the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine* by, becauſe they atteſt the *Divine Revelation* of the perſons, who deliver this Doctrine to the world. 2. As *to us* who receive the report of thoſe *Miracles*, as conveyed to us by the *Scripture*, thoſe may be ſaid to be *internal arguments* to the *Scripture*, which are there recorded in order to our believing the *Doctrine* therein contained to be *Divine*. The *Motives* of *Faith* being delivered to us now joyntly with the *Doctrine*, although on different *grounds*, we believe the *Veracity* of the *Books* of *Scripture*, and the *Infallibility* of the *Doctrine* contained in it. We believe that the *Miracles* were truly done, becauſe they are delivered to us by an unqueſtionable Tradition, in ſuch *Authentick Writings* as the *Scriptures* are; but we believe the *Doctrine* contained in the Books to be *Divine*, becauſe atteſted by ſuch *Miracles*, and we believe the Books of *Scripture* to be *divinely inſpired*, becauſe ſuch perſons cannot be ſuppoſed to *falſifie* to the world who wrought ſuch *great Miracles*. 2. You ſay, *The converſion of ſo many People and Nations by the Doctrine contained in Scripture, is alſo external to the Scripture.* But ſtill you ſuppoſe that theſe arguments are brought to prove theſe *Books* to be *divinely inſpired*, which is denied; we ſay only, That the *admirable propagation of the Doctrine of the Goſpel*, is a great argument that it was from *God*. And therefore, when afterwards you ſay, *That ſuppoſing all thoſe arguments mentioned by the Biſhop out of S.* Auguſtine, *to be internal to the Scripture, yet they cannot infallibly and divinely prove that Scripture is the Word of God.* If by *Scripture*, you mean the *Writings*, we pretend not to it; if by *Scripture*, you mean the *Doctrine* of it, we aſſert

aſſert it, and think it no argument at all againſt that, which you add, *That perſwade they may, but convince they cannot*; no doubt if they *perſwade*, they do much more than *convince*; But, I ſuppoſe, your meaning is, they do it not *effectually*; if ſo, that is not the fault of the *arguments*, but of the *perſon*, who by his *obſtinacy*, will not hearken to the *cleareſt evidence* of *Reaſon*. All that this can prove, is a neceſſity of *Divine Grace* to go along with *external evidence*, which you dare not aſſert, for fear of running into that *private Spirit*, which you objected to his Lordſhip on the ſame account. But it is very pretty which follows: You ſay, *Suppoſing that all thoſe arguments mentioned, of Miracles, nothing carnal in the Doctrine, performance of it, and converſion of the world by it, were all of them internal to Scripture, yet they could not prove infallibly the Scripture to be the Word of God*; and to prove this, you tell us, *concerning the third and fourth, How can it ever be proved, that either the performance of this Doctrine, or the converſion of nations is internal to Scripture?* But, Did you not ſuppoſe them before to be internal to *Scripture?* and though they were ſo, yet could not prove the *Scripture, &c?* and to prove that, you ſay they cannot be proved *internal to Scripture*. Which is juſt as if I ſhould ſay, if you were *Pope* you would not be *Infallible*; and all the evidence I ſhould give for it, ſhould be only to prove that you were not *Pope*. P. 110.

You conclude this *Chapter* with a *Wonder* (I mean not any thing of *Reaſon* which would really be ſo) *But*, ſay you, *who can ſufficiently wonder, that his Lordſhip, for theſe four Motives, ſhould ſo eaſily make the Scripture give Divine Teſtimony to it ſelf, upon which our Faith muſt reſt, and yet deny the ſame priviledge to the Church? Seeing it cannot be denied, but that every one of theſe Motives are much more immediately and clearly applied to the Church, than to the Scripture.* What? more immediately and clearly? and ſo clearly, that it cannot be denied? Prove but any one of them as to that *Church*, whoſe Infallibility is in queſtion, *viz.* the *preſent Roman-Church*, and I will yield you the reſt. Produce but any one *undoubted Miracle*, to confirm the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, or the *Paſtors* of it, ſhew your *Doctrine* (wherein it differs from ours) not to be *carnal*, manifeſt the *performance* of the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, only in the *members* of your *Church*, prove that it is *your Church*, *as ſuch*, which hath preached *this Doctrine*, and *converted whole nations to the belief of it* (in any other way than the *Spaniards* did the poor *Indians*) and we may begin to hearken with ſomewhat more patience to your arrogant and unreaſonable pretence of *Infallibility*. Can any one then who hath any grain of reaſon left him, think that from theſe arguments, *while his Lordſhip diſputes moſt eagerly againſt the preſent Churches Infallibility, he argues mainly for it*, as you very wiſely conclude that Chapter? If this be arguing for your *Churches Infallibility*, much good may ſuch arguments do you.

§. 11. And ſo I come to the laſt part of my task as to this Controverſie, which is, to examine your next Chapter, which puts us in hopes of ſeeing an End of this *tedious Controverſie*: But this containing very little new in it (and therefore deſerves not to be handled apart) will on that account admit of a quicker diſpatch. In which the firſt *Section* begins with S. *Auſtin's Teſtimony*, which ſhould have been conſidered before, and now it comes out with the ſame Anſwer attending it, which was given ſo lately concerning *primary and infallible, and ſecondary and probable Motives of Faith*, the vanity of which is ſufficiently diſcovered. Whereas in your *Margent*, you bring an example of ſuch a *probable Motive*, viz. *when S.* Auſtin *ſaith to* Fauſtus, *That as conſtant Tradition was ſufficient for him to believe that that Epiſtle was* Manichæus *his, which went under his name; ſo the ſame Tradition was ſufficient to him to prove the Goſpel was S.* Matthew's, *which was ſo univerſally received* P. 111. *Aug. c. Fauſtum. l. 28. c. 2.*

for

for his, ever ſince the writing of it. I am ſo far from thinking this a meer *probable Motive*, that it is the higheſt *evidence* the *matter* is capable of, and ſo S. *Auſtin* thought. Your paralleling the ſaying of *Waldenſis* (*That if the Church ſhould ſpeak any thing contrary to Scripture, he would not believe her*) with another which you pretend to be S. *Auſtin's*; *If the Scripture ſhould ſpeak any thing contrary to the Church, we could not believe that neither*; *and then ſaying that both proceed on an impoſſible ſuppoſition*, muſt imply, that it is an equal impoſſibility for the *Church* to deliver any thing *contrary* to the *Doctrine* of *Scripture*, as for the *Scripture* to *contradict* it ſelf; for to ſay, The *Scripture* ſhould contradict the *Church*, ſignifies nothing, becauſe the Being of the *Church* is founded on the *Doctrine* of Scripture. All that S. *Auſtin* ſaith, in the place you refer us to, comes to no more than this, If the *Church* were found deceived in the *Writings of Scripture*, then there could be no ground of any *firm aſſent* to them. And, is this, I pray, a fit parallel for that *ſpeech of Waldenſis?* Is this to ſay, If the *Scripture ſpeak any thing againſt the Church, it is not to be believed?*

P. 111, 112. In your next *Sect. N.* 2, 3. you fall from *Parallels*, to *Circles*, and *Semicircles* (as you call them) in which you only ſhew us your faculty of *mumbling the ſame things over and over*, concerning his Lordſhips *miſtating the Queſtion, about Infallible and Divine Faith, Apoſtolical Tradition, the formal Object of Faith*, which I muſt, out of charity to the Readers patience, beg him to look back for the ſeveral Anſwers, if he thinks any thing needs it; for I am now quite tired with theſe *Repetitions*, there being not one word added here, but what hath been anſwered already. But, leſt theſe ſhould not enough tire us, the next *Sect. N.* 4. conſiſts of the old *puff-paſte* of *ultimate*

P. 113. *Motive, and formal Object, of the Infallibility which is not ſimply Divine*, and others of a like nature, whoſe vanity hath been detected in the very entrance into this Controverſie.

It ſeems you had a great mind to give *the Biſhop a blow*, when you reach as far, as from p. 103, to p. 115. to do it, and yet fall ſhort of it at laſt; for, though you charge him with a falſe citation of S. *Auſtin*, for theſe words, *fidei ultima reſolutio eſt in Deum illuminantem*, yet in that Chapter, though not the words, yet the *ſenſe* is there extant, when he gives that account of *Chriſtian Faith, That it comes not by the authority of men, but from God himſelf confirming and inlightening our mind.* Is not here a plain reſolution of Faith *in Deum illuminantem?* And therefore your charge of *falſe citation*, and your confident denial, *That there is any ſuch Text to be found either there, or any where elſe in all S.* Auguſtine, argue, you are not careful what you ſay, ſo you may but throw *dirt* in your adverſaries *face*, though we may eaſily know from whence it comes, by the *foulneſs* of your *fingers*. And for your other challenge, *of producing any Teſtimony of the Fathers which ſaith, That we muſt reſolve our Faith of Scripture into the Light of Scripture*; I hope the Teſtimonies I have in this Chapter mentioned, may teach you a little more *modeſty*: and for the other part of it, *That we cannot believe the Scripture infallibly for the Churches authority*, as far as a *Negative* can be proved, I dare appeal to the judgement of any *one*, Whether it be *poſſible* to *believe* that the *Fathers* judged, the *Certainty*, much leſs *Infallibility* of *Chriſtian Faith* did depend on the *Churches Infallible Teſtimony*, and yet never upon the moſt juſt occaſion do ſo much as mention it, but rather ſpeak very much to the contrary.

Non tam hominibus, ſed ipſo Deo intrinſecus mentem noſtram firmante & illuminante. Aug. c. ep. Manich. c. 14.

§. 12. His Lordſhip having thus at large delivered his mind in this important Controverſie; to make what he had ſaid the more *portable*, ſumms up the ſubſtance of it in ſeveral *Conſiderations*. Which being only a *recapitulation* of what hath been fully diſcuſſed already, will need the ſhorter

Vindi-

Vindication, in ſome *brief ſtrictures*, where you unjuſtly quarrel with them. To his 1. *That it ſeems reaſonable, that ſince all Sciences ſuppoſe Principles, Theology ſhould be allowed ſome too; the chiefeſt of which is, That the Scriptures are of Divine Authority*; your Anſwer is conſiderable; *viz. that he confounds Theology, a diſcurſive Science, with Faith, which is an act of the Underſtanding, produced by an Impulſe of the Will*, &c. But not to examine what hath been already handled, of the power of the *Will in the act of Faith*, it is plain when his Lordſhip ſpeaks of *Theology*, he means *Theology*, and not *Faith*; and the intent of this Conſideration was to ſhew, the *unreaſonableneſs of ſtarting this Queſtion in a Theological Diſpute about the Church*. In your Anſwer to the *ſecond*, you ſay, *That Fallible Motives cannot produce Certainty*, which if you would prove, you would do more to the purpoſe than you have done yet, and by this argument, I could not be *certain*, whether *you had done it or no*, unleſs you brought ſome *Infallible Motives* to prove it. The third you paſs over. The fourth you grant, though not very *conſiſtently* with what you elſewhere ſay: As to what you ſay in anſwer to the fifth, *concerning Miracles*, I agree with you in it, having elſewhere ſufficiently declared my ſelf as to them. For the ſixth you refer to your former Anſwer, and ſo do I to the reply to it. In the ſeventh, his *Lordſhip* proves *the neceſſity of ſome revelation from God* rationally and ſtrongly, and thence infers, *That either there never was any ſuch Revelation, or that the Scripture is that Revelation, and that's it we Chriſtians labour to make good againſt all Atheiſm, Prophaneneſs, and Infidelity*. To which you have two Exceptions. 1. *That this cannot be proved by the meer Light of Scripture*, which His Lordſhip never pretended to. 2. *That he leaves out the Word*, only, *which was the cauſe of the whole Controverſie*; What, between *Chriſtians* and *Atheiſts*? For of that Controverſie, he there ſpeaks; but ſince you are ſo fond of your *unwritten Revelations*, pray prove the *neceſſity* of them as ſtrongly againſt *Atheiſts*, as his *Lordſhip* hath done the *neceſſity* of a *written one*. In the *laſt Conſideration* he muſters up all the ſeveral *arguments* whereby men may be perſwaded, *that this Revelation is contained in thoſe Books we call the Scripture*; as the *Tradition* of the *Church*, the *Teſtimony of former Ages*, the *conſent of times*, the *Harmony of Prophets*, and *the Prophecies fulfilled*, the *ſucceſs of the Doctrine*, the *conſtancy of it*, the *ſpiritual nature and efficacy of it*, and laſtly, the *inward light and excellency of the Text it ſelf*; which, with a great deal of *Rhetorick*, is there ſet forth. But to all this you ſay no more than what hath been abundantly diſproved, *viz. That all theſe only juſtifie our belief, when it is received as the ancients received it, upon the Infallible Authority of Church-Tradition, but never otherwiſe*. Whereas we have proved, that the *ancients* received it only on the ſame *grounds*, which are here mentioned, and therefore certainly are *ſufficient* not only to *juſtifie* our *Faith*, but to perſwade us to *believe*.

P. 114. P. 115. P. 116. Ibid.

Your argument againſt what his *Lordſhip* ſaith of the *neceſſity of the Spirit's aſſiſtance with theſe Motives, and the Light of Scripture for producing Divine Faith*, will equally hold againſt all thoſe of your own ſide, who hold the *neceſſity of Gods Spirit for believing the Churches Infallibility*, and againſt all ſuch of both ſides, *who hold any neceſſity of Divine Grace*, for then you muſt ſay, that either that *Grace* is not neceſſary in order to *ſalvation*, or *that thoſe who want it, are neither truly Chriſtians, nor capable of ſalvation*. And *how horridly ſoever theſe conſequences ſound in the ears of the unlearned*, they can ſound no worſe than thoſe *multitudes* of *Scriptures* do which tell men, That *without true Divine Faith, and real Grace, they are under eternal condemnation*. But, it may be, that the *unlearned* may not be affrighted with ſuch *ſentences* as thoſe are, you think it a great deal better to let them hear little or nothing of the *Scripture*, and to let them be continually entertained with the *ſweet*

§. 13.

and *melodious voice of the Church.* No doubt, you thought, your next argument had done the buſineſs effectually; *For* (ſay you) *to make them more ſenſible of the foulneſs of this errour, viz.* the danger of ſuch who do not ſavingly believe, *Let them conſider, that when young and unlearned Chriſtians are taught to ſay their Creed, and profeſs their belief of the Articles contained in it, before they read Scripture, they are taught to lye, and profeſs to do that, which they neither do, nor can do in his Tenet.* An excellent argument againſt making *Children* ſay their *Creed!* but, Will not the ſame hold againſt all publick uſing of the *Creed*, becauſe it is unqueſtionable but there are ſome who do not *ſavingly* or *divinely* believe it? Nay, Will it not much more hold againſt any in your *Church*, ſaying their *Creed* at all, unleſs they firſt believe your *Church* to be *Infallible*, which is very well known that all do not. For then, according to *you, they do but lye, and profeſs to do that which they neither do, nor can do, without the Churches Infallible Teſtimony:* And therefore you muſt begin a new work of *Catechizing* the *members* of your *Church*, to know whether they believe the *Churches Infallibility*, before they can ſay their *Creed.* Unleſs you ſolve it among your ſelves, by ſaying, It is not a *formal lye*, but only an *æquivocation*, which many of you ſay, is *lawful* in caſe of *danger*, as you ſee apparently this is. But if the *æquivocation* be ſaid only to lye in the word *Believe*, you might eaſily diſcern the *weakneſs* of your *argument*, through it. For if ſome may *truly believe* what they do not *ſavingly believe*, there is *no lye* certainly told, in *ſaying*, They do *believe* as far as they do; which is by a *firm aſſent* to the *Truth* of all the *Articles of Faith*, by that which is call'd an *hiſtorical*, or *dogmatical Faith*, where there may be no *ſaving Faith.* But that becauſe *Children are taught* (as a ſhort *ſyſteme* of the *Articles* of *Faith*) *to ſay their* Creed, *we muſt be convinced of the foulneſs of our errour*, is an apparent evidence, that either you apprehended our *underſtandings* to be *very weak*, or that you ſufficiently *diſcover* your *own* to be *ſo.*

P. 116.

§. 14. The only quarrel which you have with his *Lordſhips* Synthetical way is, *That he confounds his Reader with multiplicity of arguments, and weakens the authority of the Church, without which* (if you may be believed) *he might tire himſelf and others, but never be able to make a clear reſolution of Faith.* How clear an account you have given of *Faith* in your *Analytical way*, by the *Authority of the Church*, hath been ſufficiently laid open to you; but I wonder not that you quarrel with *multiplicity of arguments*, there being nothing which doth really weaken the *authority of your Church* ſo much as *they* do, and they are men certainly of your *temper*, who will *be ſoon tired with too much reaſon.* What follows concerning the *captiouſneſs of the Queſtion* as firſt propounded; and the *vicious Circle* you would free your ſelves of, by the *Motives of Credibility*; deſerve no further anſwer. Only when you would make *A. C. go your way*, and *both together prove the Church Infallible independently on Scripture*, you did not certainly conſider, that it is an *Infallibility by Promiſe*, which you challenge, and, for that end, in the precedent *Chapter*, were thoſe *places of Scripture* produced by *A. C.* and urged by you. All that I ſhall return by way of *Anſwer* to your tedious diſcourſe concerning *Scriptures being a Principle ſuppoſed among Chriſtians* (the main of it depending on the circumſtances of the diſpute between his Lordſhip and Mr. *Fiſher*) ſhall be in theſe following particulars. 1. That in all Controverſies among *Chriſtians*, whoſe deciſion depends upon the *authority of Scripture*, the *Scripture* muſt be ſuppoſed as granted to be of *Divine Authority* by both *parties.* 2. That in that *Queſtion, Whether the Scripture contains all neceſſary things of Faith*, that *neceſſity* muſt be ſuppoſed to relate to the *things* which depend upon *Scripture*, and therefore implies it believed on other grounds, that this *Scripture* is of *Divine Revelation.* For the Queſtion is, Whether *God* hath

P. 117. n. 7.

P. 118, &c. n. 8, 9, 10.

conſigned

conſigned his *Will* ſo fully to us, in this *Revelation* of himſelf, that nothing neceſſary to be believed is left out of it? For men then to ſay, That this is *left out of it*, viz. *to believe that this is a Divine Revelation*, is an unreaſonable Cavil, it being ſuppoſed in the very *Queſtion*, that it is ſo. 3. That in this ſenſe the *Scripture* may be ſaid to be a *ſuppoſed Principle*, becauſe it hath a different way of *probation*, from *particular Objects of Faith* revealed in *Scripture*. For to a *rational Enquirer*, who ſeems to doubt of the Truth of *Scriptures*, it is equally abſurd to give him any one of theſe three Anſwers. 1. *That it is a Principle to be ſuppoſed*: for, though it be ſuppoſed as to the particular debate depending on *Scripture*; yet it is fond and abſurd to ſay, It muſt be *ſuppoſed* when it is the *thing* in queſtion. 2. *That it is known meerly by its own Light*: for the perſon I have to deal with, ſuppoſing himſelf equally capable to judge of *Reaſon* and *Evidence*, as my ſelf, it doth but betray the *weakneſs* of my *cauſe*, or my *inability* to manage it, to pretend that to be *evident*, which it is much more *evident*, that he doth not think ſo; and it is only to tell him, my *Underſtanding* muſt rule *his*, and that whatever appears to me to have *Light* in it ſelf, ought likewiſe *ſo* appear to him. 3. It is as abſurd as either of the other two, to ſay, *That you will prove to a rational Enquirer, the Scripture to be Gods Word, by an unwritten Word of God.* For, 1. His Enquiry is, Whether there be *any Word of God or no*, you prove *there is, becauſe there is*; for that is all you prove by your *unwritten Word*. He denies, or at leaſt queſtions, Whether there be *any*, and particularly inſtanceth in *Scripture*; you think to end the Queſtion, by telling him, *He muſt believe it to be ſo, becauſe there is another Word of God which atteſts it*, which, inſtead of *ending* the *firſt Queſtion*, begets a great many more. For, 2. He will be more to ſeek, concerning this *unwritten Word* than before; becauſe he might uſe his *Reaſon* in judging concerning the *written Word*, but cannot as to this *unwritten*; it being only told him, There is ſuch a *thing*, but he knows not *what it is, how far it extends, who muſt deliver it, what evidence this hath beyond the other, that it comes from God*, that it muſt be uſed as an *argument* to prove it with. If you ſend him to the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, you muſt either preſume him of a very weak *Underſtanding*, or elſe he would eaſily diſcern your perfect *jugling* in this; the *veins* of which I have diſcovered throughout this diſcourſe. There remains nothing then but *Reaſon*, a Principle common to us both, by which I muſt prove, that the *Scriptures* are from *God*, which *Reaſon* partly makes uſe of the *Churches Tradition*, not in any notion of *Infallibility*, but meerly as built on *Principles common to humane nature*, and partly uſes thoſe other *arguments* which prove by the greateſt *rational evidence*, that the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture*, was from *God*; and if this were all the meaning of ſaying, *The Scriptures are a Principle ſuppoſed*, becauſe of a different way of *proving* them, from particular objects of *Faith*, you can have no reaſon to deny it.

§. 15. The next thing his Lordſhip inſiſts on, is, *That the Jews never had, nor can have any other proof, that the Old Teſtament is the Word of God, than we have of the New.* In your Anſwer to which, I grant that which you contend for, *That the Tradition of Scriptures among them, was by their immediate Anceſtors as well as others*; I grant, *That their Faith was not a Scientifical Knowledge, but a firm and perfect aſſurance only* (but underſtand not what you mean, by ſaying, *That otherwiſe it would not be meritorious*) but am as far to ſeek as ever for any *Infallibility* in the *Jewiſh Church*, which ſhould in every age be the ground of *believing* the *Books* of the *Old Teſtament* to be divinely inſpired. And if you will prove a conſtant *ſucceſſion* of *Prophets* from *Moſes* till our *Saviour*'s appearing (which you ſeem willing to believe) you would do *ſomething* towards it; but for your *permanent Infallible Authority in the High Prieſt and his Clergy*, I have already ſhewed it to be a groundleſs, if not a wilful miſtake.

P. 123. ſect. 18. n. 5.

P. 122. n. 11.

What remains concerning the *nature of Infallibility* (which at last his Lordship makes to be no more than *that which excludes all possibility of doubting*, and therefore grants, *that an Infallible Assurance may be had by Ecclesiastical and Humane proof*) and how far that is requisite to *Faith*; *concerning moral Certainty*, and what *Assurance may be had by it*; concerning *the Canon of Scripture*, *Apostolical Tradition*, *the unwritten Word*, *S.* Austin's *Testimony about the Church*, they are all points so fully discussed before, that out of pity to the Reader, I must refer him to their several places, which when he hath throughly considered, I will give him leave to *summ up* the several *victories* you have obtained in the management of it, which will be much more *honourable* for you, than for your self to do it, as you do most *triumphantly* in the *end of this Controversie concerning the Resolution of Faith*. And although I have not been much surprized with your attempts, yet I shall heartily conclude this great Debate with your last words in it. *The Consequence I leave to the serious consideration of the Judicious Reader. I beseech God he may make benefit of it to his eternal felicity.*

P. 124 sect. 19.

P. 123, &c. n. 12. ad fin. cap. 9.

PART II.

PART II.

Of Schiſm.

CHAP. I.

Of the Univerſal Church.

The Queſtion of Schiſm explained. The nature of it enquired into. Several general Principles laid down for clearing the preſent Controverſie. Three grounds of the charge of Schiſm on Proteſtant Churches by our Author. The firſt, of the Roman Churches being the Catholick Church, entered upon. How far the Roman Church may be ſaid to be a true Church. The diſtinction of a Church morally and metaphyſically true juſtified. The grounds of the Unity of the Catholick Church, as to Doctrine and Government. Cardinal Perron's *diſtinction of the formal, cauſal, and participative Catholick Church examined. The true ſenſe of the Catholick Church in Antiquity manifeſted from St.* Cyprian, *and ſeveral caſes happening in his time: as, the Schiſm of* Novatianus *at* Rome; *the caſe of* Feliciſſimus *and* Fortunatus. *Several other Inſtances out of Antiquity to the ſame purpoſe, by all which it is manifeſt that the unity of the Catholick Church had no dependance on the Church of* Rome. *The ſeveral teſtimonies to the contrary of St.* Ambroſe, *St.* Hierome, John *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *St.* Auguſtine, Optatus, *&c. particularly examined; and all found ſhort of proving that the Roman Church is the Catholick Church. The ſeveral Anſwers of his Lordſhip to the teſtimonies of St.* Cyprian, *St.* Hierome, *St.* Greg. Nazianzene, *St.* Cyril, *and* Ruffinus, *about the infallibility of the Church of* Rome, *juſtified. From all which it appears that the making the Roman-Church to be the Catholick, is a great Novelty and perfect Jeſuitiſm.*

SInce ſo great and conſiderable parts of the *Chriſtian Church*, have in theſe laſt ages been divided in communion from each other, the great conteſt and enquiry hath been, which party ſtands guilty of the cauſe of the preſent diſtance and ſeparation. For, both ſides retain ſtill ſo much of their common *Chriſtianity*, as to acknowledge that no Religion doth ſo ſtrictly oblige the owners of it to peace and unity as the *Chriſtian Religion* doth; and yet notwithſtanding this, we find theſe breaches ſo far from cloſing, that, ſuppoſing the ſame grounds to continue, a reconciliation ſeems to humane reaſon impoſſible. An evidence of which, is, that thoſe perſons who either out of a generous deſire of ſeeing the wounds of the *Chriſtian* world healed, or out of ſome private intereſt or deſign, have made it their buſi- §. 1.

neſs

ness to profound terms of reconciliation between the divided parties, have been equally rejected by those parties they have professed themselves the members of. For whether any of the *Roman Communion* have ingenuously confessed the great corruptions crept into that *Church*, and desired a reformation of them, or any of the *Protestant Communion* have endeavoured to excuse, palliate, or plead for the *corruptions* of the *Roman Church*: we find how little incouragement they have had for such undertakings from that *Church* whose Communion they have professed to retain. The distance then being so great as it is, it is a very necessary enquiry what the *cause* of it is, and where the main fault lies; and it being acknowledged that there is a possibility that *corruptions* may get into a *Christian Church*, and it being impossible to prove that *Christianity* obligeth men to communicate with a *Church* in all those *corruptions* its Communion may be tainted with, it seems evident to reason that the cause of the breach must lye there, where the corruptions are owned and imposed as conditions of Communion. For, can any one imagine it should be a fault in any to keep off from Communion, where they are so far from being obliged to it, that they have an obligation to the contrary, from the principles of their common Christianity? and where men are bound not to communicate, it is impossible to prove their not communicating to be *Schism*. For there can be no *Schism*, but where there is an obligation to communion; *Schism* being nothing else but a wilful violation of the bonds of *Christian Communion*; and therefore when ever you would prove the *Protestants* guilty of *Schism*, you must do it by proving they were bound to communicate with your *Church* in those things, which they are *Protestants* for disowning of. Or that there is so absolute and unlimited an obligation to continue in the *Society* of your *Church*, that no *conditions* can be so hard, but we are bound rather to submit to them, than not joyn in *Communion* with you. But we who look on the nature of a *Christian Society* in general, the *Foundations* of its *constitution*, the *ends* and *designs* of it, cannot think our selves obliged to Communion in those things which *undermine* those *Foundations*, and *contradict* those *ends*.

§. 2. This being a matter of so vast consequence, in order to the setling mens minds in the present disputes of the *Christian* world, before I come to particulars, I shall lay down those general principles which may manifest how free *Protestants* are, from all imputation of *Schism*. *Schism* then importing a *violation* of that *Communion* which we are *obliged* to, the most natural way for understanding what *Schism* is, is to enquire what the *Foundations* are of *Christian Communion*, and how far the *bonds* of it do extend. Now the *Foundations* of *Christian Communion* in general depend upon the acknowledgement of the *truth* of *Christian Religion*. For that *Religion* which *Christ* came to deliver to the world being supposed *true*, is the reason why any look on themselves as obliged to profess it; which *obligation* extending to all persons who have the same grounds to believe the *truth* of it, thence ariseth the ground of *Society* in this profession, which is a common *obligation* on several persons joyning together in some *acts* of common concernment to them. The truth then of *Christian Religion* being acknowledged by several persons, they find in this *Religion* some *actions* which are to be performed by several persons in Society with each other. From whence ariseth that more immediate obligation to *Christian Society*, in all those who profess themselves *Christians*; and the whole number of *those* who own the truth of Christian Religion and are thereby obliged to joyn in Society with each other, is that which we call the *Catholick Church*. But although there be such a relation to each other in all *Christians* as to make them one common Society; yet for the performance of particular *acts* of communion, there must

must be lesser *Societies* wherein persons may joyn together in the actions belonging to them. But still the *obligation* to communion in these *lesser*, is the same with that which constitutes the great body of *Christians*, which is the owning *Christianity* as the only true Religion and way to eternal Happiness. And therefore those lesser *Societies* cannot in justice make the necessary conditions of communion narrower, than those which belong to the *Catholick Church*, i. e. those things which declare men *Christians*, ought to capacitate them for communion with *Christians*. But here we are to consider that as to be a *Christian* supposeth mens owning the *Christian Religion* to be *true*, so the conveyance of that *Religion* being to us now in those *Books* we call the *Scriptures*, there must be an acknowledgement of them as the indispensable rule of *Faith* and *manners*, which is, That these *Books* are the *great Charter* of the *Christian Society*, according to which it must be governed.

These things being premised as the foundation in general of *Christian Society*, we shall the better understand how far the *obligation* to *communion* in it doth extend. For which it must be considered, that the grounds of *continuance* in *Communion*, must be suitable and proportionable to the first *reason* of entring into it. No man being obliged by vertue of his being in a Society, to agree in any thing which tends to the apparent ruine of that Society; but he is obliged to the contrary, from the general grounds of his first admission into it. His primary *obligation* being to preserve the *honour* and *interest* of it, and to joyn in *acts* of it so far as they tend to it. Now the main end of the *Christian Society* being the promotion of *Gods honour* and the *salvation* of *mens souls*, the primary *obligation* of men entring into it, is the advancement of these *ends*, to joyn in all *acts* of it so far as they tend to these *ends*; but if any thing come to be required directly repugnant to these *ends*, those men of whom such things are required, are bound not to *communicate* in those lesser *Societies* where such *things* are imposed, but to preserve their communion with the *Catholick Society* of *Christians*. But these general discourses seeming more obscure, it will be necessary for the better subserviency of them to our design, to deduce them into particulars. Setting then aside the *Catholick Society* of *Christians*, we come to enquire how far men are bound to communicate with any lesser *Society*, how extensive soever it may pretend its communion to be. §. 3.

1. *There is no Society of Christians of any one Communion, but may impose some things to be believed or practised which may be repugnant to the general Foundations of Christian Society.* But if any *Society* shall pretend a necessity of communion with her, because it is impossible this should be done by her: this priviledge must in reason be as evident as the common grounds of *Christianity* are; nay much more evident, because the belief of *Christianity* it self, doth (upon this pretence) depend on the knowledge of such *Infallibility*, and the indispensable obligation to communion depends upon it.

2. *There being a possibility acknowledged, that particular Churches may require unreasonable conditions of communion; the obligation to communion cannot be absolute and indispensable; but only so far as nothing is required destructive to the ends of Christian Society.* Otherwise men would be bound to destroy that which they believe, and to do the most unjust and unreasonable things. But the great difficulty lyes in knowing when such things are required, and who must be the judge in that case: to which I answer,

3. *Nothing can be more unreasonable, than that the Society imposing such con-*

conditions of communion ſhould be judge, whether thoſe conditions be juſt and equitable or no. If the queſtion only were in matters of peace, and conveniency, and order, the judgement of the *Society* ought to over-rule the judgements of particular perſons; but in ſuch caſes where great Bodies of *Chriſtians*, judge ſuch things required, to be unlawful conditions of communion, what juſtice or reaſon is there, that the party accuſed ſhould ſit Judge in her own cauſe?

4. *Where there is ſufficient evidence from Scripture, reaſon, and tradition, that ſuch things which are impoſed are unreaſonable conditions of Chriſtian communion, the not communicating with that Society which requires theſe things cannot incur the guilt of Schiſm.* Which neceſſarily follows from the precedent grounds, becauſe none can be obliged to communion in ſuch caſes, and therefore the not communicating is no culpable *ſeparation.*

5. *By how much the Societies are greater which are agreed in not communicating with a Church impoſing ſuch conditions, by how much the power of thoſe who rule thoſe Societies ſo agreeing is larger, by ſo much the more juſtifiable is the Reformation of any Church from theſe abuſes, and the ſetling the bonds of Chriſtian communion without them.* And on thoſe grounds, *viz.* the *Church of* Romes *impoſing unlawful conditions of communion*, it was neceſſary *not to communicate* with her; and on the *Church of* Englands *power to reform it ſelf* by the aſſiſtance of the *Supream power*, it was lawful and juſtifiable not only to redreſs thoſe *abuſes*, but to ſettle the *Church* upon its proper and true foundations. So that the *Church* of *Romes* impoſing unlawful conditions of communion, is the reaſon why we do *not communicate* with her, and the *Church of Englands* power to govern and take care of *her* ſelf, is the reaſon of our joyning together in the *ſervice* of *God* upon the principles of our *Reformation.* On theſe grounds I doubt not but to make it appear, how free the *Church* of *England* is from all imputation of *Schiſm.*

§. 4. Theſe things being thus in general premiſed, we come to conſider what thoſe principles are on which you can found ſo high a charge as that of *Schiſm* on the *Proteſtant Churches.* And having throughly conſidered your way of management of it, I find all that you have to ſay may be reſolved into one of theſe three grounds. 1. *That the Roman Church is the true and only Catholick Church.* 2. *That our Churches could have no power or cauſe to divide in their Communion from her.* 3. *That the Authority of the Roman Church is ſo great, that upon no pretence ſoever could it be lawful to withdraw from Communion with her.* I confeſs, if you can make good any one of theſe *three*, you do ſomething to the purpoſe; but how little ground you have to charge us with *Schiſm* from any of theſe Principles, will be the deſign of this *Part* at large to manifeſt. I begin then with the *firſt*, which is the pretence of your *Churches being the Catholick Church*: and here we again enter the *liſts* to ſee how fairly you deal with your *Adverſary.* Mr. *Fiſher* ſaith, *That from the Controverſie of the reſolution of Faith the Lady called them; and deſiring to hear, whether the Biſhop would grant the Roman Church to be the right Church? the Biſhop* (ſaith he) *granted that it was.* To which his Lordſhip anſwers (after a juſt complaint *of the abuſe of diſputations, by mens reſolution to hold their own, though it be by unworthy means and diſparagement of truth*) *that the queſtion was neither asked in that form, nor ſo anſwered. And that there is a great deal of difference* (*ſpecially as Romaniſts handle the queſtion of the Church*) *between The Church and A Church, and there is ſome between a True Church and a Right Church. For The Church may import the only true Church, and perhaps the root and ground of the Catholick. And this*

P. 127. ſect. 20. n. 1.

(ſaith

(ſaith he) *I never did grant of the Roman Church, nor ever mean to do. But A Church, can imploy no more, than that it is a member of the whole. And this I never did* (ſaith he) *nor ever will deny, if it fall not abſolutely away from Chriſt. That it is a True Church I granted alſo; but not a Right. For Truth only imports the being; right, perfection in conditions; thus a Thief is a true man, though not an upright man. So a corrupt Church may be true, as a Church is a company of men which profeſs the Faith of Chriſt and are baptized into his Name; but it is not therefore a right Church, either in doctrine or manners. And this* (he ſaith) *is acknowledged by very learned Proteſtants before him.* N. 2.
This is the ſubſtance of his Lordſhips anſwer, to which we muſt conſider what you reply, *That about the terms of the Lady's queſtion* you grant *to be averbal Controverſie; and that whatever her words were, ſhe was to be underſtood to demand this alone*, viz. *Whether the Roman were not the True, Viſible, Infallible Church out of which none can be ſaved; for herein* (you ſay) *ſhe had from the beginning of the Controverſie deſired ſatisfaction: And in this ſubject the Roman Church could not be any Church at all, unleſs it were the Church and a Right Church. The reaſon is becauſe St.* Peters *ſucceſſor, being the Biſhop of* Rome, *and Head of the whole Church* (as you tell us *you will prove anon*) *that muſt needs but the Church* καθ' ἐξοχὴν *if it be any Church at all. And becauſe the Church can be but one, if it be a true Church it muſt be the right Church.* P. 127. c. 2. n. 1. P. 128. n. 2.
But all this amounts only to a confident aſſertion of that which wants evident proof, which is, that the notion of a *Church* relates to *one as appointed the Head of the whole Church, without which it would be no Church at all.* Which being a thing ſo hard to be underſtood, and therefore much harder to be proved, we muſt be content to wait your leaſure till you ſhall think fit to prove it. When you therefore tell us afterwards, *That the Univerſal Church ſuppoſes the acknowledgement of the ſame Vicar of Chriſt, and that thoſe Dioceſes which agree in this acknowledgement as well as in the ſame Faith, and communion of the ſame Sacraments make up one and the ſame Univerſal Church*; When you further add, *That the Roman Church is therefore ſtiled the Church, becauſe it is the ſeat of the Vicar of Chriſt, and chief Paſtor of the Church Univerſal:* I can only ſay to all theſe confident affirmations, that if you had ſate in the *chair* your ſelf, you could not have *ſaid* more or *proved* leſs. It is not therefore in what ſenſe words *may be* taken by you (for who queſtions but you may abuſe words?) but in what *ſenſe* they *ought* to be taken. You may call *the Biſhop of Rome the Vicar of Chriſt*, but before you can expect our ſubmiſſion to him, you muſt prove *that he is* ſo. You may call the *Roman Church*, *The Church*, if you pleaſe, among your ſelves: but if by that you would perſwade us there can be no *Church* but that, you would do an office of kindneſs to offer a little at ſome ſmall proof of it, *i.e.* as much as the cauſe, and your abilities will afford. And what if *the Antients by a true Church did mean an Orthodox Church?* I know but one of theſe things will follow from it, either that they took a *true Church* for one *morally* and not *metaphyſically true*; or that if your *Church* be not an *Orthodox Church*, it can be none at all. From hence you proceed to quarrel with his *Lordſhip* for ſaying, *That may be a true Church which is not a right Church* (which is all the thanks he hath for his kindneſs to you); *for* (ſay you) *how can you call that a true Church in which men are not taught the way to Heaven, but to eternal perdition?* Which is as much as to ask, How you can call that man a *true man* that hath a *Leproſie* upon him? But if you had conſidered, what his *Lordſhip* had ſaid, you would never have made ſuch an objection. For his *Lordſhip* doth not ſpeak of the *ſoundneſs* of a *Church*, but of the *metaphyſical entity* of it. For he ſaith, *It is true in that ſenſe as* ens *and* verum, *Being and True, are convertible one with another; and every thing that hath a Being is truly that Being which it is in truth of ſubſtance. But* (ſay you), *how can that be a true Church which teacheth the way to eternal* N. 3. Sect. 2c. n. 2.

perdition by ſome falſe Doctrine in matter of Faith? *becauſe it either teacheth ſomething to be the Word of God which is not*; *or denies that to be his Word which is*: *to err in this ſort is certainly to commit high and mortal offence againſt the honour and veracity of God, and conſequently the direct way to eternal perdition.* An excellent diſcourſe to prove that no man can be ſaved that is not Infallible! For if he be not Infallible he may either *teach ſomething to be Gods which is not, or deny that to be his word that is*; *either of which being a mortal offence againſt the honour and veracity of God*, it is impoſſible any man that is not Infallible ſhould be ſaved: either then we muſt put off that humanity which expoſes us to error, or pronounce it impoſſible for any men to be ſaved, or elſe aſſert that there may be *error* where *Gods* veracity is not denyed. And if ſo, then not only men ſeverally but a *Society* of *men* may propound that for *truth* which is not, and yet not mortally offend againſt *Gods veracity*; ſuppoſing that *Society* of men doth believe (though falſly) that this is therefore *true* becauſe revealed by *God*. In which caſe that *Church* may be a *true Church* in one ſenſe, though an *erroneous Church* in another: *true*, as there is a poſſibility of ſalvation in it; *erroneous*, as delivering that for truth which is not ſo. But here is a great deal of difference between a *Church* acknowledging her ſelf fallible, and that which doth not. For ſuppoſe a *Church* propoſe ſomething *erroneous* to be believed, if ſhe doth not arrogate *Infallibility* to her ſelf in that *propoſal*, but requires men to ſearch and examine her doctrine by the *Word of God*, the danger is nothing ſo great to the perſons in her communion; but when a *Church* pretends to be *Infallible* and *teacheth errours*, that Church requiring thoſe *errors* to be believed upon her Authority, without particular examination of the *Doctrines* propoſed, is chargeable with a higher offence againſt the *honour* and *veracity* of *God*, and doth as much as in her lies (in your expreſſion) *teach men the way to eternal perdition.* And of all ſorts of *blind guides* it is moſt dangerous following ſuch who pretend to be *Infallible* in their *blindneſs*; and it is a great miracle if ſuch do not fall paſt recovery. The more therefore you aggravate the danger of *error*, the worſe ſtill you make the condition of your *Church*, where men are bound to believe the *Church Infallible*, when ſhe propoſeth the moſt *dangerous errours*.

P. 129. When you ſay, *The whole Church is not lyable to theſe inconveniences of ſeducing or being ſeduced*, if you mean (as you ſpeak) of that which is *truly the whole Church of Chriſt*, you are to ſeek for an *Adverſary* in it; if you mean the *Roman Church*, you are either *ſeduced* or endeavour to *ſeduce* in ſaying ſo, when neither that is or can be *the whole Church*, neither is it free from believing or propoſing errors, as will appear afterwards. You quarrel with his Lordſhip again, *for his Similitude of a man that may be termed a man and not be honeſt, and ſay it comes not home to the caſe.*

§. 5. But we muſt ſee, how well you have fitted it. *Inſtead of a man*, you would have *a Saint put, and then* (you ſay) *the Parallel would have held much better.* But certainly then you mean only ſuch *Saints* as *Rome* takes upon her to *Canonize*; for the Queſtion was of *one* that might be a *man*, and *not be honeſt*, Will you ſay the ſame of your *Saint* too? If inſtead of *Saint*, you had put his *Holineſs* in, there are ſome in the world would not have quarrelled with you for it. But you are an excellent man at paralleling caſes: His *Lordſhip* was ſpeaking of the *Metaphyſical Truth of a Church being conſiſtent with moral corruptions*, for which he inſtanced in *a thiefs being truly a man, though not an honeſt men*; now you, to mend the matter, make choice of *moral Integrity, being conſiſtent with Metaphyſical Truth, which is of a Saint, and a man.* And, Doth not this now come home to our caſe? That which follows, to ſhew the incongruity of his *Lordſhips* Similitude, would much more ſhew your wit, if it were capable of tolerable

P. 129. n. 3. ſenſe: *For*, you ſay, *the word Church in our preſent debate, implies not a ſimple or uncom-*

uncompounded term, as that of Man, but is a compound of ſubſtance and accidents together. We had thought man had been a *compound* of *ſubſtance* and *accidents*, as well as a *Church*: Or, Did you mean ſome *tranſubſtantiated man*, that had *accidents without ſubſtance?* But as his *Lordſhip* ſpake of a *true real man*, who yet might want *moral Integrity*; ſo he ſuppoſed there might be a *true real Church*, as to the *eſſential parts* of it, which yet might be in other reſpects a *corrupted* and *defiled Church*. But when you add, *That the notion of a Church implies Integrity and Perfection of Conditions*, ſtill you betray your weak or wilful miſtakes of a *Church Morally* for *Metaphyſically true*. If you will prove it impoſſible for a *Church* to retain its *Being*, that hath any *errors* in *Doctrine*, or *corruptions* in *Practice*, you will do ſomething to the purpoſe: but when you have done it, ſee what you get by it; for then we ſhall not ſo much as acknowledge your *Church* to be *Metaphyſically* a *true Church*. If his *Lordſhip* therefore be ſo charitable, as to ſay, *That becauſe your Church receives the Scripture as a Rule of Faith: (though but as a partial and imperfect Rule) and both the Sacraments as Inſtrumental cauſes and ſeals of Grace (though they add more, and miſuſe theſe) it cannot but be a true Church in eſſence:* And you, on the other ſide, ſay, *If it doth miſuſe the Sacraments, and make the Scripture an imperfect Rule of Faith, it would be unchurched*; Let the Reader judge, whether his *Lordſhips* charity for, or your own Teſtimony againſt your *Church*, be built on better grounds. What follows concerning the *Holy Catholick Church in the Apoſtles Creed, the intire Catholick Faith in the Athanaſian Creed, the Churches being the Spouſe of Chriſt, and a pure Virgin*, are all things as *true* in themſelves, as your *Church* is little concerned in them. The *truly Catholick Church* being quite another thing from that which goes under the name of the *Roman Catholick Church*; and this *latter* may *proſtitute* her ſelf to *error*, while the *other* remains a *pure Virgin*; and it is only your ſaying, That *yours only is the Catholick Church*, which is in effect to ſay, *That Chriſt hath a Harlot to his Spouſe*, as you ſpeak.

§. 6.

To omitt that which you call, *A further skirmiſhing about the form of words, and whether it ſavoured more of prudence, and charity, or cunning in the Jeſuite, to inſtruct the Lady what Queſtions ſhe ſhould ask*; we come to that which is the main ſubject of this chapter, *viz. Whether the Church be ſtiled Catholick by its agreeing with* Rome, *which* (you ſay) *was a received and known Truth in the Ancient Church*, but is ſo far from being in the leaſt true, that his *Lordſhip* deſervedly calls it, *A perfect Jeſuitiſm. For* (ſaith he) *in all the Primitive times of the Church, a Man, or a Family, or a National Church were accounted right and orthodox, as they agreed with the Catholick Church, but the Catholick was never then meaſured or judged by Man, Family, or Nation. But now in the Jeſuits new School, the One, Holy, Catholick Church, muſt be meaſured by that which is in the Dioceſe or City of* Rome, *or of them which agreed with it; and not* Rome *by the Catholick. So upon the matter, belike the Chriſtian Faith was committed to the cuſtody of the* Roman, *not of the Catholick Church; and a man cannot agree with the Catholick Church of Chriſt (in this new doctrine of* A. C.) *unleſs he agree with the Church of* Rome; *but if he agree with that, all is ſafe, and he is as orthodox, as he need be.* To which you ſeem to anſwer at firſt by ſome ſlight tergiverſations, *as though this did not follow from* A. C's *words, and that the Lady did not trouble her ſelf with ſuch punctilio's as thoſe of the agreement of the Catholick Church with* Rome, *or* Romes *agreeing with the Catholick Church*, but at laſt you take heart, and affirm ſtoutly, *That the Church is ſtiled Catholick from its agreement with* Rome, *and that this is no Jeſuitiſm, but a received and known Truth in the Ancient Church.* In theſe terms then I fix my ſelf, and this preſent diſpute; as containing the proper ſtate of the *Controverſie* concerning the *Catholick Church*. And if you can make it appear that

P. 129. n. 4.

P. 130. n. 4.

P. 131.

the *Church is ſtiled Catholick by agreeing with* Rome, *and that this was a received Truth in the Ancient Church*, then you may very plauſibly charge us with *Schiſm* in our ſeparation from *Rome*; but if the contrary be made evident, by your own pretence we are freed from that charge.

P. 130. n. 5. Now in the handling this Controverſie, you firſt explain your terms, and then produce your Teſtimonies. In the explication of your terms, you tell us, *The word Catholick may be uſed in three different Acceptions*, viz. *either formally, cauſally, or by way of participation. Formally, the Univerſal Church*, i. e. *the ſociety of all true particular Churches, united together in one body, in one Communion under one Head, is called Catholick. Cauſally the Church of* Rome *is ſtiled Catholick, becauſe it hath an influence and force to cauſe Univerſality in the whole body of the Church Catholick; to which two things are neceſſary, Multitude and Unity. The* Roman *Church therefore, which as a Center of Eccleſiaſtical Communion, infuſes this Unity which is the form of Univerſality, into the Catholick Church, and thereby cauſes in her Univerſality, may be called Catholick cauſally, though ſhe be but a particular Church. As he that commands a whole Army is ſtiled* General, *though he be but a particular perſon. Thirdly, every particular Orthodox Church is termed Catholick* participativè, *by way of participation, becauſe they agree in, and participate of the Doctrine and Communion of the Catholick Church. For which (* you bring *) the inſtance of the Church of* Smyrna *writing to the Catholick Church of* Philomilion, &c. *Thus we ſee* (ſay you) *both how properly the* Roman *Church is called Catholick, and how the Catholick Church it ſelf takes cauſally the denomination of Univerſal or Catholick from the* Roman, *conſidered as the chief particular Church, infuſing Unity to all the reſt, as having dependence of her, and relation to her.* Thus I have recited your words, that we may fully underſtand your meaning, the ſubſtance of which is couched in your laſt words, *That the reaſon why any any Church was accounted Catholick, was from its Union with the Church of* Rome. But if it appear that this ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* is wholly a ſtranger to Antiquity, That the *Catholick Church* was ſo call'd upon far different accounts than thoſe mentioned by you; if the *Church* of *Rome* had no other relation to the *Catholick Church* but as a *member* of it as other *Churches* were, then all this diſcourſe of yours comes to nothing, and that is it which I now undertake to prove. Now the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* lying in two things, the *Doctrine* and the *Government* of it, if in neither of theſe it had any *dependence of the Church of Rome*, then certainly it could not be called *Catholick, cauſally* from the *Church of Rome*.

§. 7. Firſt, the *Church* was call'd *Catholick* from the *Univerſal ſpread* of its *Doctrine*, and the *agreement of all particular Churches* in it. So *Irenæus* derives the *Unity* of the *Church* ſpread abroad over the world from the *Unity* of that *Faith* which was Univerſally received, and from thence ſaith, *That the Church is but as one houſe, and having one ſoul and heart, and ſpeaks as with one mouth.* Nothing can be more plain than that *Irenæus* makes the *conſent in Doctrine* to be the *ground of Unity* in the *Catholick Church*. And that he did not ſuppoſe this conſent to ariſe from the *Church of Rome* appears from what he ſaith before, *That this Faith was received in the Church ſo univerſally ſpread from the Apoſtles and their Diſciples.* Which muſt be underſtood of that univerſal diffuſion of it by the *firſt Preachers* of it in the world, the continuance of which *Doctrine* was the ground of the *Unity* in the *Catholick Church*. To the ſame purpoſe *Tertullian* gives an account of the *Churches Unity, by the adhering to that Doctrine*

Hanc prædicationem cum acceperit, & hanc fidem quemadmodum prædiximus, Eccleſia, & quidem in univerſum mundum diſſeminata, diligenter cuſtodit, quaſi unam domum inhabitans, & ſimiliter credit iis, videlicet quaſi unam animam habens, & unum cor & conſonanter hæc prædicat & docet & tradit quaſi unum poſſidens os. Irenæus adverſ. hæreſ. l. 1. c. 3.

Eccleſia enim per univerſum orbem uſq; ad fines terræ diſſeminata, & ab Apoſtolis & à diſcipulis eorum accepit eam fidem, &c. l. 1. c. 2.

ctrine which was first preached by the Apostles, who having first delivered it in Judea *and planted Churches there, went abroad and declared the same to other Nations and setled Churches in Cities, from whence other Churches have the same Doctrine propagated to them, which are therefore call'd Apostolical Churches, as the off-spring of those which were founded by them. Therefore so many and so great Churches, are all that one prime Apostolical Church from whence all others come. And thus they are all prime and Apostolical in regard of their Unity, as long as there is that communication of peace, title of Brother-hood, and common mark of hospitality.* Wherein we see, that which made *Churches* in *Tertullians* sense *Apostolical*, is the *embracing and continuing in that Doctrine which was first delivered by the Apostles*; and thus *Churches* though remote from the *Apostolical* times may have the denomination of *Apostolical* from their consent in *Doctrine* with those which were founded by them. But here is not the least intimation of *any centre of Eccleſiastical communion* infusing *unity* into the *Catholick Church*, for this *unity* ariseth from that *Doctrine* which was declared in and propagated by all the *Apostolical Churches*. So likewise *Theodoret* speaks, *That there is one Church throughout the world, and therefore we pray, for the Holy, One, Catholick, and Apostolick Church, extended from one end of the earth to the other. Which* (saith he) *is divided by Cities, and Towns, and Villages, so that there are infinite and innumerable Churches in the Islands and Continent, but all these are reduced to one, being united in the agreement of the same true doctrine.* So *Constantine* in his *Epistle* to the *Bishops* who were absent from the *Council* of *Nice*, saith, *That our Saviour would have one Catholick Church, whose members though dispersed in many several places, yet are nourished by the same Spirit which is the Will of God.* In all which and many other places which might be produced to the same purpose, we see a quite different account given of the *unity* of the *Catholick Church*, from that which you mention as the cause of it; we find the *Church* call'd *Catholick* in regard of its *large extent* in the world (as is apparent besides these testimonies, from the Controversies between St. *Austin* and the *Donatists*) and the *unity* of that *Catholick Church* not placed in the least respect to the *Church of Rome*, but in the *consent* in the *Apostolical Doctrine* in all those *Churches* which concurred as members to make up this *Catholick Church*. So that the *formal reason* of any particular *Churches* having the denomination of *Catholick*, must come not from any *communion* with the *Church of Rome*; but from the *owning* the *Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith*, and joyning in *communion* with those *Churches* which did own and acknowledge it. And therefore we find that the *symbol* of *communion* in the ancient *communicatory letters* never lay in the acknowledgment of *Christs Vicar on earth*, or communion with the *Church of Rome*, but in such things which were common to all *Apostolical Churches*. And therefore the *Church of Rome* could not be then accounted *the center of Eccleſiastical communion* as you speak, after *Cardinal Perron*, from whom you have *Verbatim* transcribed all your former discourse. This being therefore the utmost which that great wit of your *Church* was able to plead in behalf of its being the *Catholick Church*, it deserves to be further considered.

Statim igitur Apostoli —— 1. *per Judæam contestatâ fide in Jesum Christum & Ecclesiis institutis; dehinc in orbem profecti, eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei Nationibus promulgavêrunt, & proinde Ecclesias apud unamquamq; civitatem condidêrunt, à quibus traducem fidei & semina doctrinæ, cæteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuatæ sunt, & quotidie mutuantur, ut Ecclesiæ fiant: ac per hoc & ipsæ Apostolicæ deputantur, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam recenseatur, necesse est. Itaq; tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ, una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primæ & Apostolicæ, dum unâ omnes probant unitatem: dum est illis communicatio pacis, & appellatio fraternitatis, & contesseratio hospitalitatis.* Tertul. de præscript. hæretic. cap. 20.

Μία μὲν ὅτι κατ' πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν ἐκκλησία· δεῖ προσεύχεσθαι λέγομεν, ὑπὲρ ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ μόνης καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης. ἕνα μυρίαι καὶ ἀριθμὸν κρείττους εἰσὶν ἐκκλησίαι, καὶ ἐν νήσοις καὶ ἐν ἠπείροις. εἰς μίαν δὲ κοινὴν πᾶσαι τελοῦσι τὴν συμφωνίαν τῆς ἀληθοῦς εὐνομίας δόγμάτων. Thodoret. in Psal. 47. 4. Tom. 1. p. 580.

Μίαν εἶδε καθολικὴν αὐτὸς ἐκκλησίαν βεβλήκει, εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα εἰς πολλὰς τε καὶ διαφόρους τόπους τὸ μέρος διήκει, ἀλλ' ὁμοδίαιτι πνεύματι, πιστεύει τῷ θείῳ βαλήματι θάλπεται. Theod. Eccles. hist. l. 1. c. 9.

Perrons Reply to King *James* l. 4. c. 9.

§. 8. We come therefore to that kind of *unity* in the *Catholick Church* which depends on the *Government* of it; and this is that, which is pretended as the

the ground of the *Roman Churches* being the *Catholick Church*; becauſe *though* (as *Cardinal Perron* ſays) *ſhe be in her own Being particular, yet ſhe may be call'd Catholick cauſally, as the center and beginning of Eccleſiaſtical communion infuſing unity, which is the form of univerſality, into the Catholick Church.* This therefore muſt be more narrowly ſearched into, to ſee if this were *a known and received truth in the ancient Church.* Which is ſo far from it, that we find no ſuch *cauſal influence* from the *Church of Rome* then owned or aſſerted, but that the *Catholick Church* was a *whole* conſiſting of *homogeneal parts*, without any ſuch *ſubordination* or *dependence*, as the contrary ſuppoſition implies. This is, by none more fully aſſerted, than by ſuch who have with the greateſt zeal and induſtry ſtood up for the *unity* of the *Catholick Church.* The firſt of whom is St. *Cyprian*; in whoſe time and writings there are very remarkable caſes occurring to clear, upon what terms the *unity* of the *Catholick Church* did then ſtand. The firſt I begin with, is the caſe which aroſe in the *Church* about the *Schiſm* of *Novatianus*, which will give us the fuller diſcovery of the grounds of *unity* in the *Catholick Church*, becauſe the firſt riſe of this *Schiſm* was in *Rome* it ſelf. For *Novatus* coming to *Rome* in a diſcontent from *Africa*, falls in with *Novatianus* (which two names the *Greek writers* of the Church commonly confound) who being likewiſe under diſcontent at the election of *Cornelius* to be *Biſhop* of *Rome*, was ready to joyn with the other in fomenting a *Schiſm.* For which they made this their pretext, That *Cornelius* had admitted ſuch to communion who had lapſed in the perſecution of *Decius*, which tended to the overthrow of the *Churches* purity. Upon this *Novatianus* gets himſelf ordained, by three *Biſhops*, *Biſhop* of *Rome* in oppoſition to *Cornelius*: the fame of which *Schiſm* being ſpread abroad, there was great making of parties on both ſides. *Cyprian* and the *Churches* of *Africa* after full inquiry into it declare for *Cornelius*, ſo did *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* and the *Churches* there; but *Fabius* of *Antioch* with the *Churches* of *Pontus* and *Cilicia* ſuſpend, and rather encline to *Novatianus*, for ſome time; till they were after, more fully ſatisfied by *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria.* Now here is a caſe wherein the grounds of *unity* in the *Catholick Church* may be eaſily diſcerned, which it is plain from the proceedings in it, were (as in all ſuch emergent caſes) what ſhould be *determined* and *agreed* on, by the *conſent of the Catholick Church*: *i. e.* of thoſe *Churches* which all conſented in the ſame *Catholick Faith*, and therefore made up *one Catholick Church.* Now if the *Church* of *Rome* had been *the center of Eccleſiaſtical communion, and had infuſed Catholick unity into the Church at this time*, what way or poſſibility had there been for reſtoring the *Churches* unity? Neither was the appeal made to *forraign Churches* meerly becauſe *Rome* it ſelf was divided, and ſo the Controverſie could not be ended there, but it appears from the whole ſtory of the proceedings, that this was looked on as the proper means for preſerving the *unity* of the *Catholick Church*, at that time; when the Faith and communion of the *Apoſtolical Churches* were ſo fully known and diſtinguiſhed from all others. Theſe things will more fully appear from St. *Cyprians* Epiſtle to *Antonianus* upon the occaſion of this *Schiſm.* Who it ſeems at firſt adhered to *Cornelius* and with him to the *Catholick Church*, (not as though his joyning with *Cornelius* was the *cauſe* of his being with the *Catholick Church*, but becauſe in joyning with him, he joyned with the *Catholick Church*, which declared for him); but it ſeems afterwards by ſome Letters of *Novatians* he began to ſtagger, and deſires *Cyprian* to give him an account what Hereſie *Novatianus* broached, and what the reaſon was why *Cornelius* communicated with the lapſed perſons. As to which particulars he endeavours to ſatisfie him, and withal to give an account why they joyned with *Cornelius* in oppoſition to *Novatianus*, and what the practice of the

v. Rigalt. ad Cypr. ep. 49. Petav. ad Ephiphan. hæreſ 59. p. 225. Valeſ. ad Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43, 44. Albaſpin. & Balduin. in Optat.

Cyprian. ep. 52. ed. Rigalt.

the *Church* was, as to lapſed perſons, and on what reaſons it was built: wherein he tells him, That though ſome of their own *Biſhops* had formerly denyed communion to lapſed perſons, yet they did not recede from the *Unity of the Catholick Church*, or communion of the Fellowſhips, becauſe by them they were admitted. *For*, ſaith he, *the bond of concord remaining, and the communion of the Catholick Church continuing, every Biſhop orders and diſpoſeth his own actions as one that muſt give an account of his deſign to God.* Doth St. *Cyprian* here ſpeak like one that believed *the Church of Rome to be the center of Eccleſiaſtical communion?* or, *that the unity of the Church lay in acknowledging the Pope to be Chriſts Vicar, or in dependence on the Church of Rome?* when every *Biſhop is left to himſelf and God*, in all ſuch things which he may do, and yet hold communion with the *Catholick Church*? And therefore afterwards he tells us, *That there is one Church divided into many members throughout the world, and one Epiſcopal office ſpread abroad, by the conſenting multitude of many Biſhops.* If this *Church* be one in this ſenſe, and the whole Government of the Church be but as one *Biſhoprick*, as all the Biſhops unanimouſly conſent in the *management* of it; then here is not the leaſt foundation for the *Catholick Churches taking its denomination cauſally* from the *Roman Church*, and much leſs for the *Biſhops* having dependence on her, or relation to her. Since the care and government of the Church by theſe words of *Cyprian* appears to be equally committed to all the *Biſhops* of the *Catholick Church*. And from thence it was, that in this *Epiſtle* we read that St. *Cyprian* writ to the *Church* of *Rome* after the death of *Fabianus*, to adviſe them what to do in the caſe of *lapſed perſons*, which letters of his were ſent through the world; which, *Rigaltius* well obſerves, did ariſe from *that unity of Eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, whereby* Cyprian, *not doubting but the care of all Churches was upon him, diſpatched theſe Letters to the Clergy at* Rome; *from whence they were ſent through the Catholick Church, as an evidence that there was but one Epiſcopal office in the whole Church, part of which was committed in full power to every Biſhop.* Thus we ſee a quite different account given of the *unity* of the *Catholick Church* than what you from *Cardinal Perron* would perſwade us of. It being an eaſie matter for men of wit and parts (eſpecially ſuch as that great *Cardinal* was maſter of) to coyn diſtinctions to make the moſt *abſurd* things ſeem *plauſible*; but yet when they come to be examined, they are found to have no other *bottom* but the invention of that perſon who coyned them.

Manente concordiæ vinculo, & perſeverante Catholicæ Eccleſiæ individuo ſacramento, actum ſuum diſponit ac dirigit unuſquiſq; epiſcopus, rationem propoſiti ſui Domino redditurus. Cyprian. ep. 52.

Cum ſit à Chriſto una Eccleſia per totum mundum in multa membra diviſa: item Epiſcopatus unus, Epiſcoporum multorum concordi numeroſitate diffuſus. Id. ib. p. 81.

Itaq; ex unitatis Eccleſiaſticæ diſciplinâ, Cyprianus ſolicitudinem omnium Eccleſiarum ad ſe pertinere non ambigens, etiam Romæ ſe dediſſe literas ait ad clerum. Eas verò literas per totum mundum miſſas, h. e. *per Eccleſiam Catholicam, cujus Eccleſiæ unus eſt Epiſcopatus, atq; hujuſmodi Epiſcopatûs à ſingulis Epiſcopis in ſolidum pars tenebatur.* Rigalt. obſerv. ad Cypr. p. 64.

§. 9. And that it is ſo as to this diſtinction of the *formal*, *cauſal*, and *participative Catholick Church*, will be further evident from another caſe which happened in St *Cyprians* time, which was this. *Felicisſimus* and *Fortunatus* being caſt out of communion by a *Synod* of *African Biſhops*, when they ſaw they could do little good in *Africa*, run over to *Rome*, and bring letters to *Cornelius* the *Biſhop* there, miſrepreſenting the whole buſineſs of their being ejected out of the Church, on purpoſe to perſwade *Cornelius* to admit them into communion. Who at firſt being unwilling to hearken to them, was at laſt by their threats and menaces brought to receive their letters. Upon which St. *Cyprian* writes an Epiſtle to *Cornelius*, wherein he tells him, That if the threats of ſuch profligate perſons ſhould relax the *Churches* diſcipline, all the *power* and *ſtrength* of it would be ſoon taken away; that the ground of all *Schiſm* and *Hereſie* ariſes from *diſobedience to the Biſhop*. Certainly he doth not mean the *Biſhop of Rome*, but every *Biſhop* in the *Catholick Church* (for it

was

was not *Cornelius* but *Cyprian* and the *African Biſhops* who were diſobeyed) upon which he falls upon the matter of their *appeal* to a *forraign Church*, and after ſome fair commendations of the *Church of Rome* (the meaning of which will be afterwards examined) he very ſharply condemns theſe appeals to forraign *Churches* as *unreaſonable*, *unjuſt*, and *diſhonourable* to thoſe *Biſhops*, whoſe ſentence they appealed from. *For, What cauſe* (ſaith he) *could theſe perſons have of coming and declaring againſt their Biſhops? For either they are pleaſed in what they have done, and continue in their wickedneſs; or if they are diſpleaſed at it and recede from it, they know whither to return. For ſince it is decreed by us all, and it is a thing juſt and reaſonable in it ſelf, that every ones cauſe be heard where the fault was committed, and every Paſtour hath a part of the flock committed to him, which he is to rule and govern as being to give an account of it to God; it is requiſite that thoſe whom we rule over, ought not to run about, and break the concord of Biſhops by their headineſs and ſubtilty; but there to defend their cauſe, where they may have accuſers and witneſſes of their faults. Unleſs it be, that to a few deſperate and profligate perſons the authority of the Biſhops of* Africa *ſeems leſs to them, who have already ſat in judgement upon them, and ſolemnly condemned them lately for their crimes.* Can any thing be more expreſs and punctual than this teſtimony of *Cyprian* is, to overthrow that ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* which you contend for? How far were *Cyprian* and the *African Biſhops* from making *Rome the center of Eccleſiaſtical communion*, when they looked on *appeals* thither as *very unjuſt and unreaſonable*? What *acknowledgement* and *dependence* was there *on the Church of Rome* in thoſe who looked on themſelves as having *a portion of Chriſts flock committed to them, of which they were to give an account to God alone*? And I pray what excellent perſons were thoſe who undervalued the Authority of the *African Biſhops, and ran to Rome*? St. *Cyprian* tells us, they were *pauci, deſperati, perditi*, and tranſlate theſe with as much advantage to your *cauſe* as you can. So fatal hath it been to *Rome* even from its firſt foundation to be a *receptacle* for ſuch perſons. And is not this a great credit to your cauſe, that ſuch *perſons* who were ejected out of *communion* for their crimes at home, did make their reſort to *Rome*? and the more pious and ſtout any *Biſhops* were, the more they defended their own *priviledges* in oppoſition to the *encroachments* of the *Roman See*. Which was apt to take advantage from ſuch *Renegado*'s as theſe were, by degrees to get more power into her hands, and lift up her head above her *fellow-Churches*. But, leſt you ſhould think that St. *Cyprian* only ſpake theſe things in an heat, out of his oppoſition to theſe *perſons* and his deſire to cruſh them, you ſhall ſee what his judgement was concerning the ſame things when he purpoſely diſcourſeth of them. For in his Book of the *Unity of the Church*, he uſeth that expreſſion which deſtroyes all your ſubordinate union in the *Church*; which is, *Epiſcopatus unus eſt, cujus à ſingulis in ſolidum pars tenetur.* They who conſider and underſtand the importance of that ſpeech, will find nothing more deſtructive to your doctrine of the *Catholick Church* than that is. For when he makes the *Univerſal Government* of the *Church* to be but one *Epiſcopal* office, and that committed in the *ſeveral parts* of it with *full power* to *particular Biſhops*, can any be ſo ſenſeleſs to imagine that he ſhould ever think the *Government* of the *Church* in *General* to depend on any one *particular Church* as *chief* over the reſt? And that the former words do really import ſuch a *full power* in *particular Biſhops*, over *that part of the*

Quæ autem cauſa veniendi & pſeudo-epiſcoporum contra Epiſcopos factum nunciandi? Aut enim placet illis quod fecerunt, & in ſuo ſcelere perſeverant: Aut, ſi diſplicet & receſſerunt, ſciunt quò revertantur. Nam cùm ſtatutum ſit omnibus nobis, & æquum ſit paritèr ac juſtum, ut uniuſcujuſq; cauſa illic audiatur, ubi eſt crimen admiſſum, & ſingulis paſtoribus portio gregis ſit adſcripta, quam regat unuſquiſq; & gubernet, rationem ſui actûs Domino redditurus: oportet utiq; eos quibus præſumus non circumcurſare, nec Epiſcoporum concordiam cohærentem ſuâ ſubdolâ & fallaci temeritate collidere, ſed agere illic cauſam ſuam, ubi & accuſatores habere & teſtes ſui criminis poſſint: niſi ſi paucis deſperatis & perditis minor videtur eſſe auctoritas Epiſcoporum in Africâ conſtitutorum, qui jam de illis judicavêrunt, & eorum conſcientiam multis delictorum laqueis vinctam judicii ſui nuper gravitate damnârunt. Cyprian. ep. 55. p. 95.

De unitate Eccleſiæ, p. 202.

the flock which is committed to them, appears from the true importance of the phraſe *in ſolidum*; a phraſe taken out of the *Civil Law* where great difference is made between an obligation *in partem* and *in ſolidum*, and ſo proportionable between a tenure *in partem* and *in ſolidum*: thoſe things were held *in ſolidum* which were held *in full right* and *power* without *payments* and *acknowledgments*: but where the *uſus-fructus* belonged to *another*, it was not held *in ſolidum*. So that when S. *Cyprian* ſaith, that *every part belonging to each Biſhop was held in ſolidum*, he therein imports that *full right and power* which every *Biſhop* hath *over his charge*; and in this ſpeech he compares the *Government* of the *Church* to an *eſtate* held by ſeveral *Freeholders*, in which every one hath a *full right* to that ſhare which belongs to him. Whereas according to your principles the *Government* of the *Church* is like a *Mannor or Lordſhip*, in which the ſeveral *inhabitants* hold at the beſt but by *Copy* from the *Lord*; and you would fain have it *at the will of your Lord too*. But thus far we ſee S. *Cyprian* was from your modern notion of the *Catholick Church*, that he looks on the *Unity* of it as depending on the conſent of the *Catholick Biſhops* and *Churches* under their *full power*, and not deriving that *Unity* from any *particular Church* as the *head* and *fountain* of it. And therefore in the former *Schiſm* at *Rome* about *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, S. *Cyprian* imployed two of his *colleagues* thither, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, that not only by the *Letters* they carried, but by their preſence and *Counſel* they ſhould do their utmoſt endeavour *to bring the members of that divided body to the unity of the Catholick Church*. Which is certainly a very different thing from the *Catholick Church's* deriving its *Unity* from the *particular Church of Rome*. Many other inſtances of a like nature might be produced out of the *Reports* of S. *Cyprians* times, but theſe are ſufficient to evidence how far the *Unity of the Catholick Church* was then, from depending on the *Church of Rome*.

ut ad Catholicæ Eccleſiæ unitatem ſciſſi corporis membra componerent. Cypr. ep. 42.

§. 10. But, leſt we ſhould ſeem to inſiſt only on S. *Cyprians* teſtimony, it were eaſie to multiply examples in this kind; which I ſhall but touch at ſome of, and proceed. If the *Church of Rome* then had been looked on as the *center* of *Eccleſiaſtical communion*, is it poſſible to conceive, that the *excommunications of the Church of Rome* ſhould be ſlighted as they were by *Polycrates*, for which S. *Hierom* commends him, as a man of courage? that *Stephen* ſhould be oppoſed as he was by *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* in a way ſo reflecting on the *Authority* of the *Roman Church*? that *appeals* to *Rome* ſhould be ſo ſeverely prohibited by the *African Biſhops*? that *cauſes* ſhould be determined by ſo many *Canons* to be heard in their proper Dioceſes? that, when the right of *appeals* was challenged by the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, it was wholly upon the account of the imaginary *Nicene Canon*? that, when *Julius* undertook by his *ſole power* to abſolve *Athanaſius*, the *Oriental Biſhops* oppoſed it as irregular on that account, at the *Council* at *Antioch*? that, when afterwards, *Paulus*, *Marcellus*, and *Lucius* repaired to *Rome* to *Julius*, and he ſeeks to reſtore them, the *Eaſtern Biſhops* wonder at his offering to reſtore them who were excommunicated by themſelves? and that as when *Novatus* was excommunicated at *Rome* they oppoſed it not, ſo neither ought he to oppoſe their proceedings againſt theſe perſons. What account can be given of theſe paſſages, if the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* had depended on the *particular Church of Rome*? Beſides, while the *Church* of *Rome* continued regular, we find ſhe looked on her ſelf as much obliged to obſerve the *excommunications* made by other *Churches*, as others were to obſerve hers. As in the caſe of *Marcion*, who being excommunicated by his *Father* the *Biſhop* of *Sinope* in *Pontus*, and by no means

Euſebius hiſtor. Eccleſiaſtic. lib. 5. cap. 24. *Hieron. de ſcriptor. Eccleſiaſt. To.* 1.

Socrat. l. 2. *c.* 5. *Sozom. l.* 3. *c.* 5. *Socrat. l.* 2. *c.* 11.

prevailing with his *Father* for his admiſſion into the *Church* again; reſorts to *Rome* and with great earneſtneſs begs admiſſion there, where he received this anſwer; *That they could not do it without the command of his Father; for there is one Faith and one conſent, and we cannot contradict our worthy brother, your Father.* This ſhews the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* to proceed upon other grounds than the *cauſal influence of the Church of Rome*, when the *conſent of the Church* did oblige the *Church of Rome*, not to repeal the *excommunication* of a *particular Biſhop*. Upon which ground it was, that *Syneſius* proceeded ſo high in the *letters* of excommunication againſt *Andronicus*; that he forbids *all the Churches upon earth to receive him into their communion.* And withal adds, *That if any ſhould contemn his Church becauſe it was of a little City, and ſhould receive thoſe who were condemned by it, as though it were not neceſſary to obey ſo poor a Church; he lets them know that they make a Schiſm in that Church which Chriſt would have to be one.* We ſee here, on what equal terms the communion of the *Catholick Church* then ſtood: when ſo *ſmall a Church* as that of *Ptolemais* could ſo far oblige by her act the *Catholick Church* that they ſhould be guilty of *Schiſm* who admitted them to communion whom ſhe had caſt out of it. If *Syneſius* had believed the *Church of Rome* to have been the *center of Eccleſiaſtical communion*, had it not been *good manners*, nay *duty* in him to have asked firſt the *pleaſure* of the *Church of Rome* in this caſe, before he had paſſed ſo full and definitive a ſentence as this was? But the wiſe and great men of thoſe ages were utterly ſtrangers to theſe rare diſtinctions of a *cauſal*, *formal*, and *participative Catholick Church*. It is true indeed they did then ſpeak honourably of the *Church of Rome* in their age as a principal *member* of the *Catholick Church*, and having advantages above other *Churches* by its being fixed in the *ſeat* of the *Empire*, on which account her communion was much deſired by other perſons. But ſtill we find the perſons moſt apt to extol her Authority were ſuch as were moſt *obnoxious*, who not being able to hold any reputation in their own *Churches*, where their crimes and ſcandals were ſufficiently known, ran preſently to *Rome*, which was ready ſtill to take their part, thereby to inhance her power: as is moſt evident in the many diſputes which ariſe upon ſuch accounts between the *Roman* and *African Biſhops*. But theſe things we ſhall have occaſion to diſcuſs more particularly afterwards. At the preſent it may be ſufficient by theſe few (of very many examples which might be produced) to have made it appear, that it was far *from being a known and received truth in the ancient Church, that the Church of Rome was the center of Eccleſiaſtical communion*, or that *the Church was call'd Catholick from the union with her and dependence upon her.*

Οὐδυνάμεθα ἄνευ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς τιμίας παρ' ὑμῶν ποιῆσαι μίαν γνώμην καὶ πίστιν, μία ἡ οὐσία, καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀντιτιθέναι τῷ καλῷ συλλόγῳ, παρὰ δὲ σοῦ. Epiphanius hæreſ. 42. ſect. 1.

Εἰ δέ τις ὡς μικροπόλιτην καταφρονοῖ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ δέξεται τοὺς καταμεμφθέντας αὐτῆς, ὡς ἐν ἀνάγκῃ τῷ πένητι πειθόμενος, ἴσωθι ταῦτα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἣν εἷναι δεῖ μίαν. Syneſ. epiſt. 58. p. 203. ed. Petav.

§. 11. But we muſt now conſider what ſtrenuous proofs you produce for ſo confident an affirmation: your inſtances therefore being the moſt pregnant to your purpoſe which you could find in *Antiquity* muſt be particularly examined: your firſt is of S. *Ambroſe*, *relating that his brother* Satyrus *going on ſhore in a certain City of* Sardinia (where he deſired to be Baptiſed) *demanded of the Biſhop of that City whether he conſented with the Catholick Biſhops, that is* (ſaith he) *with the Roman Church.* Theſe words I grant to be in S. *Ambroſe*, but whoſoever throughly conſiders them will find how little they make for your purpoſe. For which it will be ſufficient to look on the following words, which tells us, that

P. 131.

Advocavit ad ſe Epiſcopum loci, percontatuſque eſt utrum cum Epiſcopis Catholicis, hoc eſt, cum Romanâ Eccleſiâ conveniret. D. Ambroſ. orat. in obit. fratr.

that at that time there was a *Schiſm* in the *Church*, and *Sardinia* was the chief ſeat of it. For *Lucifer Caralitanus* had newly ſeparated himſelf from the *Church*, and had left Societies there which joyned in his *Schiſm*. For *Caralis* was the Metropolis of *Sardinia*, and it appears by S. *Hierom*, that the *Luciferians* confined the *Church* only to *Sardinia*, which is the cauſe of that expreſſion of his; *That Chriſt did not come meerly for the ſake of the Sardinians*. So that thoſe *Luciferians* were much like the *Donatiſts*, confining the *Church* only to their own number. Now there being ſuch a *Schiſm* at that time in *Sardinia*, what did *Satyrus* any more than enquire whether the *Biſhop* of the *place* he reſorted to was guilty of this *Schiſm* or no? *But* (ſay you) *he made that the tryal whether he was a Catholick or no, by asking whether he agreed with the Church of Rome*. To which I anſwer, that there was very great reaſon for his particular inſtancing in the *Church of Rome*. 1. Becauſe *Satyrus* was originally of the *Church of Rome* himſelf; for *Paulinus* in the life of S. *Ambroſe* (*Satyrus* his brother) ſpeaking of him after his conſecration to be *Biſhop*, ſays, *Ad urbem Romam hoc eſt ad natale ſolum perrexit*, *He went to Rome*, i. e. *to the place of his birth*; now *Satyrus* being originally a *Roman*, what wonder is it that he ſhould particularly enquire of the *Roman Church?* As ſuppoſe one of the *Gallican Church* of *Arles* or *Vienna* ſhould have been caſt upon ſhore in another *Iſland* belonging to *France* at the ſame time, and underſtanding there was a *Schiſm* in the place, ſhould particularly enquire whether they agreed with the *Catholick Biſhops*, i. e. with the *Church* of *Arles* or *Vienna*, Could you hence infer that either of theſe were *the center of Eccleſiaſtical communion*, and if not from hence, how can you from the other? Or ſuppoſe, in the time of the *Donatiſts Schiſm* in *Africk*, a ſtranger coming accidentally thither and deſiring communion with the *Chriſtians* of that *City* he was in, ſhould enquire of the *Biſhop* of the *City*, whether he communicated with the *Catholick Biſhops*, *i. e.* with the *Church* of *Hippo* or *Carthage*, Could you hence infer that *Hippo* was *cauſally the Catholick Church*, and if not, with what reaſon can you do it from ſo parallel a caſe? 2. Becauſe *Sardinia* did belong to the *Metropolitan Province* of the *Church* of *Rome*; it being one of the *Suburbicarian Provinces* under the juriſdiction of the *Roman Lieutenant*, and conſequently one of the *Suburbicarian Churches* appertaining to the *Metropolital power* of the *Biſhop of Rome*: and therefore it was but reaſon to ask whether the *Churches* in *Sardinia* did agree with their *Mother Church* or no. But all this is very far from implying that the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* comes from the particular *Church of Rome*: on this account, becauſe at that time when the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* was preſerved by that continual *correſpondence* between the parts of it by the *formed letters* and otherwiſe, who ever was known to have communion with any one particular Church (which communicated with the reſt) had thereby communion with the *Catholick Church*. So that on that account the queſtion might as well have been asked of the *Churches* of *Milan*, *Agobio*, or any other in *Italy* as of the *Church of Rome*. For whoſoever communicated with any of them did communicate with the *Catholick Church*, as well as thoſe who did communicate with the *Church of Rome*. So that your firſt inſtance will prove no more the *Church of Rome* to be the *fountain* and *center* of *Eccleſiaſtical communion*, than any other particular Church. Your ſecond is, from S. *Hieroms* ſaying, *That the Church of* Alexandria *made it her glory to participate of the Roman Faith*. But doth it hence follow that

Et forte & ad id locorum in Schiſmate regionis illius eccleſia erat. Lucifer enim ſe à noſtrâ tunc temporis communione diviſerat, & quanquam pro fide exulaſſet, & fidei ſuæ reliquiſſet hæredes, non putavit tamen fidem eſſe in Schiſmate. Id. ib.

Nec oò Sardorum tantum Maſtrucam Dei Filium deſcendiſſe. Hieron. c. Lucifer. init.

Maſtruca veſtis Barbaricæ genus, quam Sardi ſuâ linguâ Maſtrucam appellant: ſignificans multos adhuc ſapereſſe bonos Chriſtianos, etiamſi nulli eſſent in Sardinia, in quâ ſolâ ille Chriſti eccleſiam eſſe volebat. Eraſmus in Scholiis.

Sed tu ſcite, &c. Romanam fidem Apoſtoli co ore laudatam, cujus ſe eſſe participem Alexandrina Eccleſia gloriatur. Hieron. ep. 68. ad Theophil.

the *Church* of *Alexandria* was therefore *Catholick*, becauſe ſhe participated of the *Faith* of the *Roman Church* conſidered as a particular Church? For, any one who reads that *Epiſtle* will eaſily ſee, that S. *Hierom* there ſpeaks of the *Roman Faith*, not as it *proceeds* from the *Roman Church*, but as it was *received* by it; and that he doth not underſtand it of the then *preſent Roman Faith*, any further than it agreed with that *Faith* which the *Apoſtle* commended in them. So that the utmoſt which can be extracted out of this teſtimony, is, that it was the *glory* of the *Church* of *Alexandria* to hold the ſame *Faith* which the Primitive *Roman Church* did, for which the *Apoſtle* commended it. Which is apparent by the deſign of the whole *Epiſtle*, which is to encourage *Theophilus* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* to ſuppreſs the *Nefarious Hereſie* (as he calls it) of the *Origeniſts*; for, it ſeems, *Theophilus* then dealt more mildly with them, which *Hierom* was diſpleaſed at. And therefore tells him, that although he took ſome care by the diſcipline of the *Church* to reduce them, yet that was not enough, and thence brings in theſe words; *But withal know, that nothing is more our deſign than to preſerve the rights of Chriſt, and not to tranſgreſs the bounds of our Fathers, and always to remember the Roman Faith, commended by the mouth of the Apoſtle, which is the glory of the Church of* Alexandria *that ſhe is a partaker of.* If you had dealt ſo fairly as to have cited S. *Hierom*'s words at large, any one might eaſily ſee how remote they were from your purpoſe; it being manifeſt by them, that S. *Hierom*'s only deſign was; To perſwade *Theophilus* to aſſert the ancient *Faith* againſt the incroachments of modern Hereſies; and, to incourage him to it, mentions that commendation which was given to the *ancient Faith* by the *Apoſtle* writing to the *Romans* upon their receiving it; and therefore ſince the ſame *Faith* was in the *Church* of *Alexandria* which the *Romans* were commended for receiving of, *Theophilus* ought to be a vigorous aſſertor of *it*, againſt the oppoſitions of *Hereticks*. But how from hence we ſhould infer that the *Church* of *Rome* was the *fountain* of *Faith* as well *as center of communion*, is a thing we are yet to ſeek for, till you further direct us. Yet, it may be, the ſtrength of it lies in this, *That the Roman Faith was commended by the Apoſtle.* And was not the Faith of other *Churches* where it was pure, commended as well as that? And although the *Fathers* in their complemental addreſſes to the *Church* of *Rome* were pleaſed often to mention this, *That the Roman Faith was praiſed by the Apoſtle*; yet, as *Rigaltius* well obſerves, *That the Latin Fathers took thoſe words of the Apoſtle, as though their Faith were more pure and ſincere than in other places; whereas the Apoſtle only ſaith, that he gave thanks to God that there was ſuch a fame abroad, that the Romans who ſwayed the world, had embraced the Chriſtian Faith. Which by reaſon of the dignity of the City which was head of the world, and empreſs of Nations, did conduce much to the propagation of the Chriſtian Faith.* For that there was no peculiar excellency in the *Roman Faith* above the Faith of other *Churches*, appears from the *ſcope* of this *Epiſtle* which was to inſtruct and ſettle them in the right Faith, and *from* the *teſtimonies* of the *Author* of the *Commentaries* under S. *Ambroſe*'s name, and S. *Hierom* himſelf. The former tells us, The reaſon why S. *Paul* commended their Faith, was, *Becauſe though they ſaw no miracles yet they believed, though not ſo purely*

Sed tamen ſcito, nobis nihil eſſe antiquius quàm Chriſti jura ſervare, nec patrum tranſire terminos, ſemperque meminiſſe Romanam fidem Apoſtolico ore laudatam, cujus ſe eſſe participem Alexandrina Eccleſia gloriatur. Hieron. Theoph. Tom. 2. p. 110. ed. Chevall. 1533.

Sic omnes ferè Latini Patres, Pauli ad Romanos verba accepêrunt, quaſi rectior & ſincerior fuiſſet apud Romanos fides: cum hoc tantum dicat Apoſtolus; agere ſe gratias Deo, quod ubique paſſim fama ſit, etiam Romanos verum Dominos, fidem Chriſtianam ſuſcepiſſe. Quod certe ob dignitatem urbis quæ totius orbis erat caput & gentium Domina, valdè ad fidei Chriſtianæ propagationem conducebat. Rigaltius Obſervat. ad Cyprian. epiſt p. 78.

Quia nulla virtutum videntes inſignia, ſuſcepêrunt fidem Chriſti, quamvis corrupto ſenſu. Ambroſ. præfat. in epiſt. ad Roman.

as

as they ought to have done. And afterwards ſaith, *That S.* Paul *commends their Faith although it were not exact according to rule, yet ſince by that they came to worſhip God in Chriſt he rejoyceth in it, knowing they might increaſe more in it.* And S. *Hierom* elſewhere ſpeaking without deſign or intereſt, ſaith, *Not that the Romans have any other kind of Faith than what all other Churches have; but that there was greater devotion and ſimplicity in believing.* And withal adds, that the very ſame faults which the *Apoſtle* condemned them for then, did continue ſtill among them, the greateſt of which was *Pride.* And if this preſent Controverſie do not make good S. *Hieroms* obſervation till this time, we are ſtrangely miſtaken: for what greater *Pride* can there be, than for any *particular Church* to arrogate the title of *Catholick* to her ſelf, and to make all others no farther *Catholick* than they participate of her Faith and Communion?

Quamvis non ſecundum regulam ab autoribus traditæ veritatis, tamen quia quod ab uno Deo erat, interpoſito nomine Chriſti, cœperant venerari, gratulatur; ſciens illos poſſe proficere. Id. ad v. 8. c. 1.

Non quod aliam habeant Romani fidem, niſi hanc quam omnes Chriſti Eccleſiæ; ſed quod devotio in eis major ſit & ſimplicitas ad credendum. Hieron. præfat. in l. 2. comment. in epiſt. ad Galat. Tom. 9.

§. 12. Concil. Tom. 3. p. 747.

Your next Teſtimony is that of *John,* the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople,* who did in his Epiſtle to *Hormiſda, judge thoſe to be ſevered from the communion of the Catholick Church, who did not conſent in all things with the See Apoſtolick:* but the main force of your teſtimonies lyes in a preſumption that men will never take the pains to examine them. We muſt therefore conſider the occaſion and manner of the writing this *Epiſtle;* for thoſe words you cite, are not the words of the *Patriarch* himſelf, but of the form of *ſubſcription* required by *Hormiſda* in order to an *Union* of the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches;* which had been then a long time in a *Schiſm.* For after that *Acacius* ſtood up ſo reſolutely in defence of the *rights* of his *See* at *Conſtantinople,* the *Roman* Biſhops (who made it then their deſign to infringe the *liberties* of other *Churches* the better to inhance their own) would by no means admit of any reconciliation, unleſs the names of *Acacius,* and thoſe who defended him in that *See* being his Succeſſors, as *Phravita, Euphemius, Macedonius,* &c. were expunged out of the *Diptychs* of the *Church;* which being ſo unjuſt and unreaſonable a demand, for a long time the *Patriarchs* of *Conſtantinople* would by no means aſſent to it. But after the death of the *Emperour Anaſtaſius, Juſtine* ſucceeds in the throne, one who made it his buſineſs to have this *breach* made up; in order to which he writes to *Hormiſda,* and earneſtly perſwades him to a reconciliation; and ſo likewiſe doth the *Patriarch John.* But it hath been the common practice of the *Biſhops* of that *Church,* to be therein unlike the *unjuſt Judge,* that they will not be wrought on by *importunities;* but have been the more implacable, the more they have been ſought to: as it appeared in this preſent caſe. For this ſoure and inflexible *Pope* would not yield to any terms of *Union,* but upon conditions of his own preſcribing, which were, the *expunging* of *Acacius,* and *ſubſcribing* that *form* which he ſent to them. Which when the *Emperor* and *Patriarch* ſaw, though they were ſufficiently diſpleaſed at it, yet out of their greedy deſire of peace, they were contented rather to *ſwallow* theſe hard conditions than ſuffer the *Schiſm* to remain ſtill. Now it is in this *form* of *ſubſcription* that theſe words are contained, wherein they promiſe, *not to recite the names of thoſe in the ſacred myſteries, who are ſevered from the communion of the Catholick Church,* i. e. *who conſent not in all things with the See Apoſtolick.* But leſt theſe words being thus inſerted by the *Pope* himſelf, ſhould be interpreted to the diſadvantage of other *Churches,* and particularly that of *Conſtantinople;* The *Patriarch* makes a Preface to that *Subſcription* by way of *Proteſtation;* wherein after declaring the reception of

of the *Pope*'s *letters*, and congratulating the hopes of *Union*, he manifeſts his own deſire of peace, and his willingneſs to refuſe the communion of all Hereticks. *For*, ſaith he, *I look on thoſe moſt holy Churches of your elder and our new* Rome, *as both making but one Church.* And after, declaring his aſſent to the decrees of the four *General Councils*, he adds, *That thoſe who oppoſed them he judged fallen off, à Sanctâ Dei generali & Apoſtolicâ Eccleſiâ*, from the holy *Catholick and Apoſtolick Church.* Now when the *Patriarch* was thus careful to explain himſelf, ſo as to aſſert that the *Church* of *Rome*, and that of *Conſtantinople*, made but one *Church*, when he adds what he means by the *Catholick Church*, viz. *the truly General and Apoſtolical Church*; infer as much from *Hormiſda*'s words as you will, I am ſure you can do little to your purpoſe from the *Patriarchs*, taking them in the ſenſe he explains himſelf in, by this *Proteſtation.* So that the meaning of them is only this, that as he judged the *Church of Rome* a member of the *Catholick Church* (whoſe *Unity* required, that thoſe who were out of communion in one *Church* ſhould be ſo with the reſt) ſo he conſented to acknowledge them juſtly *excommunicated* whom the *Church of Rome* would have to be ſo. So that hence nothing ariſeth to your purpoſe, more than will equally advance the authority of any other particular *Church*; whoſe excommunications did oblige the *whole Church*, as we have ſeen already in the caſe of *Sinope* and *Ptolemais*.

Sanctiſſimas enim Dei Eccleſias, i. e. *ſuperioris vetuſtæ, & novellæ iſtius Romæ unam eſſe accipio, illam ſedem Apoſtoli Petri, & iſtius Auguſtæ civitatis unam eſſe definio.* Joh. Patriarch. ep. inter ep. Hormiſd. 35.

§. 13. You proceed to another Teſtimony of S. *Auſtin* addreſſing himſelf to the *Donatiſts*, telling them, *That the ſucceſſion of the Roman Biſhops is the rock which the proud gates of Hell overcome not, thereby inſinuating, that the very ſucceſſion of thoſe Biſhops is in ſome true ſenſe the Catholick Church.* But from whence doth it appear that the ſucceſſion of the *Roman Biſhops* is the *Rock* here ſpoken of? For S. *Auſtin* was there arguing againſt the *Donatiſts* and ſhewing them the danger of being ſeparated from the unity of the *Catholick Church*; that if they were cut off from the *vine*, *they would wither and be in danger to be caſt into the fire*; and therefore exhorts them, *to come and be planted into the vine, it being a grief to them to ſee them cut off.* Now in order to this, he brings in the former words to acquaint them with the way, whereby they might better underſtand the *Catholick Church*, which could not in reaſon be confined to their own *age*, but muſt be derived from the *Apoſtles*. So that his counſel is of the ſame nature with that of *Tertullian* and *Irenæus*, who put men upon a diligent ſearch into the *ſucceſſions* of the *Apoſtolical Churches*. But now when by this ſearch they have found out the *Catholick Church*, he tells them, *That is the Rock which the proud gates of Hell cannot overcome.* For ſo elſewhere S. *Auſtin* calls the *Catholick Church* a *Rock*, as he calls it likewiſe a *Houſe*, and a *City*, in ſeveral places of theſe *diſputations* againſt the *Donatiſts*. As here before he calls it the *Vine*, *from whence all who are cut off, wither and dye*: But what is all this to the particular *Church of Rome*; which none of the *Diſputes* with the *Donatiſts* at all concerned? As is fully manifeſt from the whole management of that Controverſie; in which though he was ſo much put upon ſhewing what and where the *Catholick Church* was, yet he never once expreſſed any ſuch thing, as that the *Church* was called *Catholick* from any relation to the *Church of Rome*, but ſtill mentions it as a particular *Church*, which

Numerate ſacerdotes vel ab ipſâ ſede Petri & in ordine illo Patrum quis cui ſucceſſit videte. Ipſa eſt Petra quam non vincunt ſuperbæ Inferorum Portæ. D. Aug. in Pſalm. C. part. Donat. Tom. 7. col. 9.

Unite fratres, ſi vultis ut inſeramini in vite: Dolor eſt cum vos videmus præciſos ita jacere.

Tertul. de præſcript. c. 36. Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

Auguſt. de baptiſm. c. Donatiſt. l. 3. c. 18. l. 4. c. 12. l. 7. c. 51. Adverſ. Petilian. l. 2. c. 70. De Unitat. Eccleſ. cap. 20.

which with other *Churches* made up one *Catholick Church*. So in his *Commentaries* on the 44th *Pſalm*: *Behold* Rome, ſaith he, *behold* Carthage, *behold ſeveral other Cities*; *theſe are Kings daughters and have delighted the King in his honour, but they all make up but one Queen.* How incongruous had this expreſſion been, had S. *Auſtin* believed the *Roman Church* to be ſo much above all others, that the ground why any others were called *Catholick*, was from their union with her; and therefore he muſt according to your principles have ſaluted the *Church of Rome* as the *Queen* of all the reſt, and made other particular *Churches* but as her *daughters* and *hand-maids*. But S. *Auſtin* knew of no ſuch difference, but looked on all particular *Churches*, whether at *Rome*, *Carthage* or elſewhere, as making up but one *Catholick Church*. And to the ſame purpoſe he frequently ſpeaks, when he ſayes, *That the Church is call'd One in regard of her Unity, and Many in regard of the ſeveral Societies of Chriſtians abroad in the world*; When he calls the ſeveral *Churches*, *members of that one Church which is ſpread all over the world*, without ſetting any note of diſcrimination upon one above all the reſt; When he reckons the *Roman*, *Corinthian*, *Galatian*, *Epheſian Churches* together, and that all theſe and the *Churches* propagated from them, do conſpire in one *Univerſal Church*. But the places are ſo many to this purpoſe in him, that it would look too much like oſtentation to offer to prove a matter ſo evident to all that read any thing in him. And is it poſſible then for you to think *That S.* Auſtin *made the ſucceſſion of Biſhops at* Rome *in any ſenſe the Catholick Church?* You might as well ſay, that he made the *Church* ſpread all over the world a *particular Church*, as that he made any *particular Church* whether at *Rome* or elſewhere (for he makes no difference) to be in any ſenſe the *Univerſal Church*.

Ecce Roma, ecce Carthago, ecce aliæ & aliæ civitates: filiæ Regum ſunt, & delectaverunt Regem ſuum in honore ipſius; & ex omnibus fit una quædam Regina. Aug. in Pſ. 44. p. 282. ed. Froben.

Propter unitatem Eccleſiæ, una Eccleſia; propter congregationes fraternas per loca multæ ſunt Eccleſiæ. Id. in Pſal. 141.

An placet vobis, ut contra Eccleſias quæ membra ſunt unius Eccleſiæ tot orbe diffuſæ, &c. Id. de Unitat. Eccleſ. c. 11.

Verum etiam illas Eccleſias ſuas in Scripturis Apoſtolicis & Canonicis pariter legimus non ſolum Romanorum, verum etiam Corinthiorum, Galatarum, Epheſiorum, &c. Ut taceam de aliis tam latis atq; univerſis terrarum partibus, in quas ex his Apoſtolicis laboribus & plantationibus porrecta crevit, & creſcit Eccleſia. Id. c. Creſcon. Grammat. l. 2. c. 37.

§. 14. But that which you ſeem to lay the greateſt force on, is the teſtimony of *Optatus Milevitanus*, *Who*, ſay you, *after he had ſaid that S.* Peter *was head of all the Apoſtles*; *and that he would have been a Schiſmatick, who ſhould have erected another chair againſt that ſingular one of S.* Peter, *as alſo that in that chair of S.* Peter *being but one, Unity was to be kept by all*; *he adds that with* Syricius *then Pope he himſelf was united in communion, with whom the whole world* (*ſaith he, meaning the whole Catholick Church*) *agrees by communicatory letters in one Society of communion*; *See here* (ſay you) *how clearly he makes the union with the Biſhop of* Rome *the meaſure of the Catholick Church*; *which the Biſhop calls a Jeſuitiſm, and further proves himſelf to be in the Catholick Church, becauſe he was in communion with the See of S.* Peter. For our better underſtanding the meaning of theſe words of *Optatus*, we muſt conſider the ſtate of the Controverſie between *Optatus* and *Parmenianus*, by which it will appear, how very little theſe words of his make to your purpoſe. The main queſtion between the *Catholicks* and the *Donatiſts* was, about the *Catholick Church*, To whom it was that title did belong. The difficulty ſeemed the greater, becauſe there was no difference between them in any matter of *Faith*, or in the ſubſtance of the *Sacraments*, and therefore they were fain to find out other means to decide this Controverſie, than by either of thoſe two. For which the *Catholicks* made choice of theſe two arguments *Univerſality* and *Succeſſion*, the former as agreeing with that large *ſpread* of the *Church* which was Propheſied to be in the times of the *Goſpel*, whereas the *Donatiſts* confined the *Church* to a Corner in *Africa*: the latter in regard of the neceſ-

Ibid.

ſity

ſity of deriving themſelves from the *Apoſtolical Churches*. Now the *Donatiſts* denying any but themſelves to be the *Catholick Church*, the proof lay on their *Adverſaries* part, who upon all occaſions offer to make it good, That the *Church* from which the *Donatiſts* ſeparated themſelves, was the only *true* and *Catholick Church*. Accordingly *Optatus* having in the firſt book diſcuſſed the matters of *fact* about the riſe of the *Schiſm*, the ordinations of *Cecilian* and *Majorinus*, and the proceedings uſed for the ending the *Schiſm*, in this ſecond Book he enters on the Controverſie of the *Church* which *Parmenianus* would have to be only among themſelves; againſt which he urgeth firſt, that then certainly the *Church* could not be called *Catholick*, becauſe it was ſo called *from its large comprehenſion and univerſal ſpread*. Had *Optatus* believed, the ground of the *Churches* being *Catholick* had been its union with the *Church* of *Rome*, he would never have given that account of its being *called ſo*, which here he doth. After which he produceth many places of *Scripture* to prove the large *extent* of the *Church*, and concludes, *That to be the Catholick Church which was diffuſed over all the world*, than which nothing can be more contrary to your pretenſions, who limit and confine the *Catholick Church* to your own party as the *Donatiſts* did. And if thoſe arguments then uſed againſt the *Donatiſts* had any force againſt them, they have ſtill as much againſt you, who exclude ſo great and conſiderable *Churches* from being members of the *Catholick Church* becauſe not of your communion. From hence *Optatus* proceeds to examine, Which had the better title to be the *Catholick Church* on the account of *Succeſſion*; and *Parmenianus* reckoning the *Cathedra* in the firſt of the *dotes Eccleſiæ*, *Optatus* begins with that by which is underſtood the *lawful derivation of power for governing the Church*, ſo *Albaſpinæus*, (as well as others) underſtands it. Now the Controverſie was, where this *Cathedra* was. *Optatus* proves, *there can be no lawful power but what is derived from the Apoſtles*, and therefore where the *ſucceſſion* is plain and uninterrupted, there and no where elſe can that *Cathedra* be. *Which Epiſcopal chair being firſt placed at* Rome *by S.* Peter, *in which he as chief of the Apoſtles ſate, from whence he had his name* Cephas; *in which one chair Unity ſhould be kept by all; leſt the other Apoſtles ſhould ſet up others againſt it; ſo that he muſt be a ſchiſmatick and offender, who ſhould place another chair againſt that. Therefore in this one chair S.* Peter *ſate firſt, to whom ſucceeded* Linus, *to him* Clemens, *and ſo on to* Siricius *who joyns with us, with whom the whole world communicates by the entercourſe of formed letters. Do you now give an account of your chair, who challenge to your ſelves the name of the Holy Church.* To paſs by that ridiculous account of the name *Cephas*, which *Baldwin* ſuppoſes to be inſerted into the text from ſome ignorant gloſs made in the margin, the main thing to be conſidered, is the ſcope and deſign of theſe words; in which he doth two things, 1. He ſhews the evident ſucceſſion of the *Catholick Biſhops* from S. *Peter* in the *Church of Rome*, which he doth by a diſtinct and particular enumeration of them. 2. From thence ſhews the unlawfulneſs of ſetting up another *chair* in oppoſition to that, *i. e.* pretending to another right of *Government* than what was conveyed down from the *Apoſtles*; or ſetting up another *chair* in oppoſition to that of S. *Peter* at *Rome*, *i. e.* that ſucceſſion of *Biſhops* which was derived from

ubi ergo erit proprietas Catholici nominis, cum inde dicta ſit Catholica, quod ſit rationabilis & ubiq; diffuſa? Optat. l. 2.

Cathedram Epiſcopalem, primam miſſionem, omnem poteſtatem, à quâ cæteræ deducerentur. Albaſpinæus in Optat. lib. 2.

Igitur negare non potes, ſcire te in urbe Româ Petro primo Cathedram Epiſcopalem eſſe collatam; in quâ ſederit omnium Apoſtolorum caput Petrus; inde & Cephas appellatus eſt; in quâ unâ Cathedrâ, unitas ab omnibus ſervaretur, nè cæteri Apoſtoli ſingulas ſibi quiſque defenderent: ut jam Schiſmaticus & peccator eſſet, qui contra ſingularem Cathedram, alteram collocaret. Ergo Cathedra unica quæ eſt prima de dotibus, ſedit prior Petrus: cui ſucceſſit Linus, Lino Clemens, &c. Damaſo Siricius hodie, qui nobiſcum Socius: Cum quo totus orbis commercio formatarum in unâ communionis ſocietate concordat. Veſtræ Cathedræ vos originem reddite, qui vobis vultis ſanctam Eccleſiam vendicare. Optatus l. 2. *Sed ſuſpicor hæc verba (unde Cephas appellatus eſt) eſſe ineptæ alicujus gloſſæ ad marginem temerè adſcriptæ & deinde ab librariis contextui inſertæ.* Balduin in Optat. l. 2.

from him. Now, ſaith he, God providing for the unity of the *Church*, intended there ſhould be but one *chair* in a place, *i. e.* that the ſeveral *Apoſtles* ſhould not in the ſame *place* ſet up a diſtinct *Cathedra* or *ſucceſſion* of *Church-Governours*, and therefore though St. *Paul* as well as St. *Peter* were inſtrumental in the ſettling the *Church of Rome*, yet, that the *Churches Unity* might be preſerved, there were not two diſtinct *ſeries* of *Biſhops*, the one deriving from St. *Peter* and the *other* from St. *Paul*. So that *Optatus* his ſaying is much of the ſame nature with that of *Cyprian* in the caſe of the *Schiſm* about *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, who urgeth that moſt, *That there ought to be but one Biſhop in one Church*, now the *Biſhop* and his *Cathedra* are *correlates* to each other. *Optatus* therefore ſaying that there was but *one Cathedra* at *Rome*, puts the *Donatiſts* upon this iſſue, that if they could not deduce their *ſucceſſion* from St. *Peter* at *Rome*, they could have no pretence to the *Cathedra* there. And therefore challengeth them to deduce the *ſucceſſion* of their *Biſhops* there, as at large appears in his following diſcourſe. Which could be no higher than of *Macrobius* from *Encolpius*, *Encolpius* from *Bonifacius Ballitanus*, as he from *Victor Garbienſis*, who was ſent over on purpoſe from the *Donatiſts* in *Africk* to make a faction and a party at *Rome*, among the *African Inhabitants* there. Now this being the utmoſt *ſucceſſion* they could pretend to, and that being in oppoſition to that *ſucceſſion* which was derived from St. *Peter*, nothing could be more plain than that at *Rome* (about which the Conteſt was) the *Cathedra* could not belong to the *Donatiſts* but their *Adverſaries*; and therefore that being by *Parmenianus* acknowledged one of the *dowries* of the *Catholick Church*, the title of that could not belong to the *Donatiſts* but their oppoſers. This therefore doth not at all concern *Romes* being *cauſally the Catholick Church*, but is only produced as a particular *Church* for a *known inſtance* whereby to decide this particular Controverſie of ſucceſſion. For otherwiſe the argument would have held as well for any other *Apoſtolical Church* where the ſucceſſion was clear: And therefore afterwards he makes the *communion with the ſeven Churches as plain an argument of communion with the Catholick, as he doth here of the Church of* Rome. You may therefore every jot as well make the *ſeven Churches* of *Aſia*, to be *cauſally the Catholick Church*, as the *Church* of *Rome*. And to the ſame purpoſe he inſtanceth *in the Corinthian*, *Theſſalonian*, *Galatian Churches*, as he doth in that of *Rome*, or the *ſeven Churches*. We ſee then, *Optatus* his deſign was to ſhew that their *Church* from which the *Donatiſts* ſeparated, was the true *Catholick Church*, which he proves from their *communion* with all the *Apoſtolical Churches*, which had a clear and diſtinct ſucceſſion from the *Apoſtles* their planters. And becauſe of the *Vicinity* and *Fame* of *Rome*, and the eaſier knowing the ſucceſſion there, he inſtanceth in *that* in the firſt place, and then proceeds to the reſt of them. But withal, to ſhew the *Unity* of all theſe *Apoſtolical Churches*, when he had mentioned *Siricius* as the preſent *Biſhop* of *Rome*, he adds, *That all the world agreed with him in the entercourſe of the formed Letters*; not thereby intimating any *ſupremacy* of that *Church* above others, but to ſhew that that ſucceſſion he inſtanceth in at *Rome*, was of the *Catholick Church*, becauſe the *whole Chriſtian world*, did agree in *Communion* with him that was the *Biſhop* there. And when he ſpeaks of *one chair*, it is plain, he means it of the particular *Church* of *Rome*, becauſe every *Apoſtolical Church* had an *Apoſtolical Chair* belonging to it. So *Tertullian* expreſly, *That in all the Apoſtolical Churches there were their Chairs ſtill remaining*. And *Euſebius* particularly

ubi ſedit victor Garbienſis, à veſtris jam dudum de Africâ ad paucos erraticos miſſus, &c. Optatus ibid.

Extra ſeptem Eccleſias quicquid foris eſt, alienum eſt. Id. ib.

Tibi unitas diſplicet; hoc ſi crimen putas, argue nos Theſſalonicenſibus, Corinthiis, Galatis, ſeptem Eccleſiis quæ ſunt in Aſia, communicâſſe. Ibid.

Percurre Eccleſias Apoſtolicas apud quas ipſæ nunc Cathedræ Apoſtolorum ſuis locis præſidentur. Tertul. præſcript. ad hæret. cap. 36.
Euſeb. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 7. c. 32.

mentions the *Apoſtolical Throne* or *Chair* at *Hieruſalem*, as others do that of *Mark* at *Alexandria*, and of the reſt elſewhere. Nothing then can poſſibly be inferred from theſe words of *Optatus* concerning the *Church* of *Rome*, but what would equally hold for any other *Apoſtolical Church*, and how much that is, let the Reader judge: And how much ſoever it be, it will be very little for your advantage, who pretend to ſomething *peculiar* to the *Church* of *Rome* above all other *Churches*.

§. 15. Ibid. From *Optatus* you proceed, or rather return to S. *Hierom*, who, (ſay you) *profeſſes the Church is built upon S.* Peter's *See, and that whoever eats the Lamb, that is, pretends to believe in Chriſt, and partakes of the Sacraments out of that houſe, that is, out of the communion of that Church, is prophane, and an Alien; yea, that he belongs to Antichriſt, and not to Chriſt, whoever conſents not with the ſucceſſor of S.* Peter. This Teſtimony ſounds big and high at firſt, and I ſhall not impute theſe expreſſions either to S. *Hierom*'s *heat*, or his *flattery*, although it looks the more ſuſpicious, becauſe at that time he had ſo great a *pique* againſt the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, and that theſe words are contained in a complemental addreſs to *Damaſus*. But, ſetting aſide what advantages might be gained on that account, to weaken the *force* of this *Teſtimony*, if we conſider the occaſion or nature of theſe expreſſions, we ſhall find that they reach not the purpoſe you deſign them for. We muſt therefore conſider, that at the time of the writing this *Epiſtle*, S. *Hierom* ſeems to be in a great perplexity what to do in that diviſion which was then in the *Church* of *Antioch*, concerning *Paulinus*, *Vitalis*, and *Miletius*; but beſides this *Schiſm*, it ſeems S. *Hierom* ſuſpected ſome remainders of *Arrianiſm* to be ſtill among them; from their *demanding* of him, Whether he acknowledged three diſtinct *hypoſtaſes* in the *Trinity*. Now S. *Hierom* by *hypoſtaſis* underſtands the *eſſence*, as many of the *Greek Fathers* did; and thence the *Sardican Council* defined, *That there was but one hypoſtaſis of the Father, Son, and Spirit*; and therefore he ſuſpects, that when they require of him the acknowledgement of *three hypoſtaſes*, they might deſign to entrap him, and unawares betray him into *Arrianiſm*. And therefore argues ſtifly in the remainder of that *Epiſtle*, that *hypoſtaſis* properly ſignifies *eſſence*, and nothing elſe; and from thence urgeth the inconvenience of admitting the terms of three *hypoſtaſes*. Now S. *Hierom* being thus ſet upon by theſe *Eaſtern Biſhops*, he keeps off from communion with them, and adviſeth with the *Egyptian Confeſſors*, and follows them at preſent; but having received his *Baptiſm* in the *Church* of *Rome*, and being looked on as a *Roman* where he was, he thought it neceſſary to addreſs himſelf to *Pope Damaſus*, to know what he ſhould do in this caſe. And the rather, becauſe if S. *Hierom* had conſented with them, they would have looked on it as an evidence of the agreement of the *Roman Church* with them. Therefore he ſo earneſtly and importunately writes to *Damaſus* concerning it, as being originally part of his charge, having been *baptized* in that *Church*.

Ego nullum primum (præmium fortaſſe vectius) niſi Chriſtum ſequens, beatitudini tuæ, id eſt Cathedræ Petri communione conſocior. Super illam Petram ædificatam Eccleſiam ſcio. Quicunq; extra hanc domum Agnum comederit, profanus eſt — Quicunq; te um non colligit, ſpargit, hoc eſt, qui Chriſti non eſt, Antichriſti eſt. Hieron. ep. 57. ad Damaſ.

Theodoret. l. 2. c. 8.

Tota ſtrepulacrum literarum Schola nihil aliud hypoſtaſin niſi niſi ἐσίαν novit. Id. ib.

Inde nunc meæ animæ poſtulans cibum, unde olim Chriſti veſtimenta ſuſcepi. Ib. *Ab Arrianorum præſule & Campenſibus, novellam à me homine Romano nomen exigitur.* Ib.

But (ſay you) *whatever the occaſion of the words were, Is it not plain, that he makes the Church to be built on S.* Peter's *See, and that whoſoever is out of the communion of that Church, is an Alien, and belongs to Antichriſt?* To that therefore I anſwer, 1. That he doth not ſay, that the *Catholick Church* is built on the particular *Church* of *Rome*: for it is not, *ſuper hanc Petram*, as referring to the *Cathedra* immediately preceding; but, *ſuper illam*, and therefore it is not improbably ſuppoſed by ſome, that the *Rock* here refers to *Chriſt*. And,

And, although *Eraſmus* doth imagine, that ſome particular *priviledge* and *dignity* did belong to *Rome* above other *Churches* from this place (which is not the thing we contend about) yet withal he ſays, that by the *Rock* we muſt not underſtand *Rome*; for *that may degenerate: but we muſt underſtand that Faith which* Peter *profeſſed.* And it is a much eaſier matter for *Marianus Victorius*, to tell him, *he lyes*, as he doth here in plain terms, than to be able to confute what he ſaith. And that the rather, becauſe he begins his diſcourſe in that manner, *Ego nullum primum niſi Chriſtum ſequens*, whereby he attributes the *ſupreme power*, and infallible judgement in the *Church* only to *Chriſt*. For, as for your learned correction of *præmium* for *primum*, though you follow *Cardinal Perron* in it, yet it is without any probability at all, it being contrary to all the *MSS.* uſed by *Eraſmus*, *Victorius*, *Gravius*, *Poſſevin*, and others; and hath no authority to vouch it, but only *Gratian*, who is condemned by your own Writers, for a falſifier and corrupter of Authors.

Non ſuper Romam arbitror, nam fieri poteſt ut Roma degeneret, ſed ſuper illam fidem quam Petrus profeſſus eſt. Eraſmus in Schol. *Etſi non minus alius eam laborâſſe, Eraſmus licmentiatur.* Mar. Victor. Schol. in ep. 57.

2. I anſwer, when S. *Hierom* pronounces *thoſe Aliens and prophane, who are out of the communion of the Church*; either it belongs not to the particular *Church* of *Rome*, or, if it doth, it makes not much for your purpoſe. 1. There is no certainty that he there ſpeaks of the *particular Church* of *Rome*, but that he rather ſpeaks of the true *Univerſal Church*; for it is plain, he ſpeaks of that *Church which is built upon the Rock:* now by your own confeſſion, that cannot be the *Church* of *Rome*, for that you ſuppoſe to be the *Rock* it ſelf, *viz.* the *See* of *Peter*, and therefore the *Church* built upon it, muſt be the *Univerſal Church.* And that this muſt be his meaning, appears from his plain words, for he ſaith, *Upon that Rock the Church is built, and whoſoever eats the Lamb without this houſe, is prophane*; —— he cannot certainly mean, *Whoſoever eats without the Rock*, but *without the houſe built upon it*; ſo that the *houſe* in the latter *clauſe* muſt needs be the ſame with that *which was built on the Rock* in the former. Either therefore you muſt deny the *See of Peter* to be the *Rock*, or you muſt of neceſſity aſſert the *houſe built upon it* to be the *Univerſal Church*, and not the particular one of *Rome*; and conſequently the danger lyes not upon mens not being in communion with the *Roman*, but with the *truly Catholick Church.* And how from hence you will infer, *That they are prophane who are out of the Roman Church*; it would be worth our while to underſtand. 2. Suppoſe I ſhould grant, that S. *Hierom* did mean the particular *Church* of *Rome*, yet I am not ſatisfied, that this comes home to your purpoſe, unleſs you could prove, that S. *Hierom* ſpake of what was neceſſarily and unalterably to be in the *Church* of *Rome*, and not meerly of what was in that time, when he ſpake theſe words. But that is your perpetual *Paralogiſm* in the citations of the *Fathers*, in praiſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, what they ſpake, and it may be deſervedly of the *Church* of their own time (although ſometimes their *Rhetorick* ſwell'd too high in their *Encomiaſticks*) that you will needs have to be underſtood of the ſame *Church* at all times, and in our preſent age. As though it were not poſſible for a *Church* to be eminent for *purity* of *Doctrine* in one age, and to decline as much from it in another. But I need give no other inſtance in this caſe, than St. *Hierom* himſelf, for if we believe St. *Hierom* in his *Catalogue*, *the two immediate predeceſſors of* Damaſus, *in the See of* Rome, Liberius, *and* Felix *were tainted with Hereſie*; and that very *Hereſie*, *viz. Arrianiſm*, which S. *Hierom* writes to *Damaſus* about now. I pray, tell us then, Whether if S. *Hierom* had lived in *Liberius* his time, would he have writ to him after the ſame rate he now writes to *Damaſus*; if he had been of the ſame mind then, he would have been ſo far from ſcrupling the three *hypoſtaſes*, that he muſt have ſubſcribed the *Arrian confeſſion*, as

Vid. Fortunat. & Acacius.

S. *Hierom* tells us, *Liberius* did, through the inſtigation of *Fortunatianus*. And therefore to let us ſee, on what account he was now ſo liberal in his commendations of the *Church* of *Rome*, he begins this *Epiſtle* with the praiſe *of her preſent orthodoxneſs in the Catholick Faith, And that amongſt all the diviſions and breaches of the Eaſtern Churches, they preſerved the Faith of their Fore-fathers entire. That now the Sun of Righteouſneſs riſes in the Weſt; but that Lucifer, who fell, now reigns in the Eaſt*; with many expreſſions to the ſame purpoſe. Which ſuppoſition being granted true at that time, that which follows infers very little to your purpoſe, unleſs you can prove, that what was ſo then, muſt neceſſarily continue ſo in all ages. If the *Eaſt* was then corrupted, and the *Weſt* only ſound, what praiſes belonged to the *Catholick Church* in general, did of right devolve to that part which remained *ſound* in the opinion of thoſe perſons who judged ſo. You would needs therefore from hence have your Church accounted *Catholick* now, by the ſame argument that *Tully* ſaid (of the *Roman Lady*, who ſtill affirmed, ſhe was but *thirty years* of age) that he believed it, for he had heard her ſay ſo *twenty years* before; ſo muſt we believe your *Church ſound* and *Catholick*, becauſe it was ſaid ſo of her ſo many *hundred years* ſince; as though no *infirmities* or *wrinkles* could have come upon her ever ſince. Prove your *Church* to be as *ſound* and *orthodox*, as *pure* and *holy* now, as ſhe was in the primitive *Fathers* time, and we will not grudge her the higheſt of thoſe *commendations* which were given her by them. But, without doing this, your Teſtimonies come to nothing. The ſame Anſwer will ſerve the remaining Teſtimonies of *Eulalius*, and the *Emperour Gratian*, who only ſpake of the *communion* of the *Church* of *Rome*, as it was then: That of *Fulgentius* ſtiling the *Roman Church*, The *top of the world*, only imports the *eminency* of it, in regard of the power of that City it was in, and ſo is wide enough from your purpoſe. Thus we have conſidered all that you have produced out of *Antiquity*, to prove that the *Church* is called *Catholick*, with a particular relation to, and dependance of the *Church* of *Rome*; and can find nothing at all belonging to her, as the *center of Catholiciſm*, but that thoſe things which are ſaid of her, and communion with her, *in relation to being called Catholick*, might as well have agreed with any other *Apoſtolical Church* remaining ſound in the *Catholick Faith*.

Proſiliato à ſobole mala patrimonio, apud vos ſolos incorrupta Patrum ſervatur hæreditas. — Nunc in Occidente Sol Juſtitiæ oritur, in Oriente autem Lucifer ille, qui ceciderat, ſuper ſydera poſuit thronum ſuum, &c. Ibid.

P. 132. n. 6. Hence it appears, that what his Lordſhip is pleaſed to term, a *perfect Jeſuitiſm, viz. the meaſuring the Catholick Church, by that of* Rome, is really nothing elſe, and that *the perfect miſtake* belongs to you, who aſſert, that *it was a received and known Truth in the Ancient Church*. Your vindication of the propriety of your *Churches* being called *the Roman Catholick Church*, from the *Roman Empire*, and the *Jewiſh Church*, would then ſignifie ſomething, when you have proved that the *Pope* hath as much the *Government* of the *Church*, as the *Roman-Emperour* had of all the *Provinces* within the confines of the *Empire*, or that we are all bound as much to reſort to *Rome*, as the *Jews* were to *Jeruſalem* for the ſolemn worſhip of God. In the mean time the abſurdity is never the leſs for being vulgar, in calling yours, The *Roman Catholick Church*. And yet, as though you had been only demonſtrating theſe things, you tell us very magiſterially, *The truth is, in all doubts concerning matter of Doctrine, recourſe is to be had to S.* Peter's *ſucceſſor, who (at leaſt with a General Council) can infallibly reſolve all difficulties*. An excellent way of proving, to ſay, *The truth is*: Might not I as well ſay, *The truth is*, the *Pope* neither in *Council*, nor out of it hath any Infallibility at all? And would not this be full as good an *Anſwer* as yours is an *Argument*? But *the very truth is*, you had rather have theſe things believed, than go about

to

to prove them; leſt the weakneſs of the arguments ſhould lay too much open your fond pretence of *Infallibility*. Before you prove, *That the Pope can carry his Infallibility out of* Rome *with him*, ſhew us that he hath it there. I grant S. *Peter had been infallible, though he had never been at* Rome; and it is far from being clear, that the *Pope* is at all the more *infallible* for *his being there*. How far you have been from proving, *That the Faith of every particular Church is to be examined and proved to be Catholick by its conformity to the Faith of the* Roman *Church*, may abundantly appear from the preceding diſcourſe. *Thoſe Queſtions*, which you ſay, *make nothing to your purpoſe concerning the Popes transferring his chair at* Rome, *and the* Roman *Clergies deſerting him and the true Faith*: I ſhall ſo far believe you in, as to eaſe my ſelf of the trouble of conſidering them any further than hath been done already in the very entrance into this Conference.

§. 16. And here, you tell us, *You now come to perform your Promiſe, viz. to examine more fully his Lordſhips pretended ſolutions* (as you call them) *of* Bellarmine's *authorities in behalf of the Infallibility of the Church of* Rome. But for all your boaſting at firſt, what great things you would do, you ſeem a little fearful of engaging too far, and therefore are reſolved only to maintain them in general, as they make for the *Infallible Authority* of the *Church*, or of the *Pope defining Articles of Faith in a General Council*. But, as far as you dare go, I ſhall attend your motions, and doubt not to make it evident, that none of theſe *authorities* have any reference to that ſenſe, which you only offer to maintain them in, and that though they had, yet no ſuch thing as *Infallibility* can be proved out of them.

P. 133. The firſt authority is out of S. *Cyprian*'s Letter to *Cornelius Biſhop of Rome*, whoſe words I am contented ſhould be recited as fully as may be; In which he chargeth *Feliciſſimus* and *Fortunatus with their Complices, that having ſet up a Biſhop againſt him at* Carthage, *they ſail to the chair of* Peter, *and the principal Church from whence the ſacerdotal Unity had its riſe, and carry Letters from prophane and Schiſmatical perſons, not conſidering that the* Romans (*whoſe Faith was commended by the Apoſtle*) *were ſuch to whom perfidiouſneſs could not have acceſs.* Now the meaning of this place you would have to be this, and no other, *viz. that the See of S.* Peter, *which is the principal of all Churches, was ſo infallibly directed by the Holy Ghoſt, that no errour in Faith could have acceſs to it, or be admitted by it if not as a particular Church, yet at leaſt as the head of the Univerſal Church of Chriſt, and as the Fountain of Prieſtly Unity*; *which S.* Cyprian *here expreſly affirms that Church and See to be.* This you ſumm up at laſt, as the moſt which can be made of this Teſtimony; and which is indeed far more in all particulars than it can amount to. Which will appear by particular examinations of what you return in anſwer to his Lordſhip. Three things his Lordſhip anſwers to this place. 1. *That* perfidia *can hardly ſtand here for errour in Faith*; and if ſo, then this can make nothing for *Infallibility*. 2. *That ſuppoſing it granted to ſignifie errour in Faith and Doctrine, yet it belongs not to the* Romans *abſolutely, but with a reſpect to thoſe firſt* Romans *whoſe Faith was commended by the Apoſtle*. 3. *That it ſeems to be rather a Rhetorical inſinuation, than a dogmatical aſſertion.* And that S. *Cyprian* could not be ſuppoſed to aſſert herein the *Popes Infallibility*, appears by the *contracts* between him and the *Biſhops* of *Rome*. This is the ſhort of his Lordſhips anſwers to this place, to which we muſt conſider what you reply. 1. His Lordſhip ſays, *That perfidia can hardly ſtand for errour in Faith or misbelief, but it properly ſignifies malicious falſhood in matter of truſt and action, not errour in Faith, but in fact againſt the diſcipline and Government of the Church*. And to make this interpretation appear the more

Poſt iſta adhuc inſuper pſeudoepiſcopo ſibi ab hæreticis conſtituto, navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram, atq; ad Eccleſiam Principalem; unde unitas ſacerdotalis exorta eſt, & Schiſmaticis & prophanis literas ferre, nec cogitare eos eſſe Romanos (quorum fides Apoſtolo prædicante laudata eſt) ad quos perfidia habere non poſſit acceſſum. Cyprian. ep. 55. ad Cornel. n. 16.

P. 134.

Sect. 3. n. 3, &c.

pro-

probable, his Lordſhip gives an account of the ſtory which was the occaſion of writing that *Epiſtle*, which is this, as his Lordſhip reports it from *Binius* and *Baronius*; *In the year* 255. *there was a Council in* Carthage *in the cauſe of two Schiſmaticks*, Feliciſſimus *and* Novatian, *about reſtoring of them to the communion of the Church, which had lapſed in time of danger from Chriſtianity to Idolatry.* Feliciſſimus *would admit all even without penance, and* Novatian *would admit none, no not after penance. The Fathers* 42 *in number went, as Truth led them, between both extreams. To this Council came* Privatus *a known Heretick, but was not admitted becauſe he was formerly excommunicated, and often condemned. Hereupon he gathers his Complices together, and chooſes one* Fortunatus (*who was formerly condemned as well as himſelf*) *Biſhop of* Carthage, *and ſet him up againſt St.* Cyprian. *This done* Feliciſſimus *and his Fellows haſte to* Rome *with letters teſtimonial from their own party, and pretend that* 25 *Biſhops concurred with them: and their deſire was to be received into the communion of the Roman Church, and to have their new Biſhop acknowledged.* Cornelius *then Pope, though their haſte had now prevented St.* Cyprians *letters, having formerly heard from him, both of them, and their Schiſm in* Africk, *would neither hear them, nor receive their letters. They grew inſolent and furious (the ordinary way that Schiſmaticks take). Upon this* Cornelius *writes to St.* Cyprian, *and St.* Cyprian *in this Epiſtle gives* Cornelius *thanks for refuſing theſe* African *fugitives, declares their Schiſm and wickedneſs at large, and encourages him and all Biſhops to maintain the Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline and cenſures againſt any the boldeſt threatnings of wicked Schiſmaticks.* This being the ſtory, his Lordſhip ſays, *He would fain know why* perfidia (*all circumſtances conſidered*) *may not ſtand here in its proper ſenſe for cunning and perfidious dealing, which theſe men having practiſed at* Carthage, *thought now to obtrude upon the Biſhop of* Rome *alſo, but that he was wary enough not to be over-reached by buſie Schiſmaticks?* This demand of his Lordſhip ſeeming very juſt and reaſonable we are bound to conſider what reaſons you give,
P. 113. why *perfidia* muſt be underſtood *for errour in Faith* and not in the ſenſe here mentioned. *Why calls he* (ſay you) *St.* Peters *chair*, Eccleſiam principalem (*the chief Church*) *but becauſe it is the head to which all other Churches muſt be ſubordinate in matter of doctrine? the words following ſignifie as much,* Unde unitas ſacerdotalis exorta eſt, *from which chair of St.* Peter *as it were from its fountain, unity in Prieſthood and conſequently unity in Faith is derived. Why brings he the Apoſtle as Panegyriſt of the Roman Faith? Is it forſooth, becauſe no malicious falſhood in matter of truſt or errour in fact againſt the Diſcipline and Government of the Church can have acceſs unto them, as the Biſhop will needs miſinterpret the place? or rather becauſe no errour in Faith can approach the See Apoſtolick? Certain it is,* perfidia *in this ſenſe, is diametrically oppoſed to the Faith of the Romans immediately before commended by the Apoſtle (which was true Chriſtian Faith) and conſequently it muſt of neceſſity be taken for the quite contrary,* viz. *misbelief or errour in Faith.* Three Arguments in theſe words you produce, why *perfidia* muſt be underſtood of *errour in Faith.* 1. *Becauſe the Church of* Rome *is called the chief Church*; but is it not poſſible it ſhould be called ſo in any other ſenſe, but as the *head of all other Churches in matter of doctrine?* Is it not ſufficiently clear from *Antiquity*, that there were other accounts of calling the *Church of Rome* the *chief* or *principal Church*, as the *eminency* of it joyned with the *power* of the *City* (the *potentior principalitas* in *Irenæus*) which advanced its reputation to the height it was then at? What *matters of doctrine* do you find brought to the *Church* of *Rome* to be *Infallibly* decided there in St. *Cyprians* time? how little did St. *Cyprian* believe this, when he ſo vehemently oppoſed the judgement of *Stephen Biſhop of Rome* in the caſe of *rebaptization?* Doth he write, ſpeak, or carry himſelf in that

Contro-

Controverſie like one that owned that *Church of Rome* to be *head* of all *other Churches*, to which they muſt be ſubordinate in *matter of doctrine?* Nay in the very next words St. *Cyprian* argues againſt *appeals* to *Rome*, and is it poſſible then to think, that in theſe words he ſhould give ſuch an *abſolute power* and *authority* to it? And therefore any one who would reconcile St. *Cyprian* to *himſelf* muſt by thoſe words of *Eccleſia principalis* only underſtand the *dignity* and *eminency*, and not the *power*, much leſs the *Infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome*. And no more is implyed in the Second, *That it is ſaid to be the fountain of Sacerdotal Unity*, which ſome think may probably refer to the *Prieſthood* of the *Church of Africk*, which had its riſe from the *Church* of *Rome*, as appears by *Tertullian* and others, in which ſenſe he might very well ſay, that *the Unity of the Prieſthood did ſpring from thence*; or if it be taken in a more large and comprehenſive ſenſe, it can import no more than that the *Church* of *Rome* was owned as the *Principium Unitatis*, which certainly is a very different thing from an *infallible judgement* in matters of Faith. For what connexion is there between *Unity* in *Government*, and *Infallibility* in *Faith?* Suppoſe the *Church* of *Rome* ſhould be owned as the *principal Member* of the *Catholick Church*, and therefore that the *Unity* of the *Church* ſhould begin there in regard of the *dignity* of it, doth it thence follow that there muſt be an *abſolute ſubordination* of all other *Churches* to it? Nothing then can be inferr'd from either of thoſe particulars, that by *perfidia*, errour in Faith muſt be underſtood, taking thoſe two expreſſions in the moſt favourable ſenſe that can be put upon them. But conſidering the preſent ſtate of the *Church* of *Rome* at the time when *Feliciſſimus* and *Fortunatus* came thither, I am apt to think another interpretation more probable than either of the foregoing. For which we muſt remember that there was a *Schiſm* at *Rome* between *Novatianus* and *Cornelius*, the former challenging to be *Biſhop* there, as well as the latter, upon which a great breach was made among them. Now theſe perſons going out of *Africa* to *Rome*, that they might manage their buſineſs with the more advantage, addreſs themſelves to *Cornelius* and his *party*; upon which St. *Cyprian* ſaith, *Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram atque ad Eccleſiam principalem, unde Unitas ſacerdotalis exorta eſt*, thereby expreſſing their *confidence* that they not only went to *Rome*, but when they were there, they did not preſently ſide with the *Schiſmatical party* of the *Novatians* there, but as though they had been *true Catholicks*, they go to *Cornelius*, who, being the legal ſucceſſor of S. *Peter* in oppoſition to *Novatianus*, calls his *See the chair of St.* Peter, and the *principal Church*, and the *ſpring of the Unity of the Prieſthood*; becauſe the contrary party of *Novatianus* had been the cauſe of all the *Schiſm* and *diſunion* which had been among them. And in this ſenſe which ſeems very agreeable to St. *Cyprians* words and deſign, we may eaſily underſtand what this *perfidia* was, *viz.* that *falſeneſs* and *perfidious dealing* of theſe perſons, that although they were *Schiſmaticks* themſelves, yet they were ſo far from ſeeming ſo at their coming to *Rome*, that as though they had been very good *Catholicks*, they ſeek to joyn in communion with *Cornelius* and the *Catholick party* with him. By which we ſee what little probability there is from thoſe *expreſſions* that *perfidia* muſt be taken, *for an errour in Faith.* But, 3. You ſay, *To what purpoſe elſe doth he mention St.* Pauls *commendation of their Faith, if this* perfidia *were not immediately oppoſite to it?* But then inform us what part of that *Apoſtolical Faith* was it, which *Feliciſſimus* and *Fortunatus* ſought to violate at *Rome?* It is apparent their whole deſign was to be admitted into *communion* with the *Church* of *Rome* (which in all probability is that *acceſs* here ſpoken of): if therefore this *perfidia* imported ſome *errour in Faith*, it muſt be ſome *errour* broached by thoſe particular perſons as contrary to the old *Roman Faith* which was extoll'd

Tertul. de præſcript. c. 36. Greg. l. 7. Ind. 1. ep. 32.

extoll'd by the *Apoſtle*. And although theſe perſons might be guilty of *errours*, yet the ground of their going to *Rome*, was not upon any *matter of Doctrine*, whereby they ſought to corrupt the *Church* of *Rome*, but in order to the juſtifying of their *Schiſm*, by being admitted into the *communion* of that *Church*. Notwithſtanding then any thing you have produced to the contrary, there is no neceſſity of underſtanding *perfidia*, for an *errour in matter of Faith*. And St. *Cyprians* mentioning the praiſe given to the *Romans* for their *Faith* by the *Apoſtle*, was not to ſhew the oppoſition between that and the *perfidia* as an *errour in Faith*, but that being the greateſt *Elogium* of the *Church* of *Rome* extant in *Scripture*, he thought it now moſt convenient to uſe it, the better to engage *Cornelius* to oppoſe the proceedings of the *Schiſmaticks* there. Although withal, I ſuppoſe St. *Cyprian* might give him ſome taſt of his old office, of a *Rhetorician* in the alluſion between *fides* and *perfidia*, without ever intending that *perfidia* ſhould be taken in any other ſenſe than what was proper to the cauſe in hand.

You having effected ſo little in the ſolution of his Lordſhips firſt anſwer, you have little cauſe to boaſt in your following words, *That hence his other*
Ibid. *explication alſo vaniſhes into ſmoak*, viz. *when he aſſerts that* Perfidia non poteſt *may be taken hyperbolically for* non facile poteſt; *becauſe this interpretation ſuits not with thoſe high Elogiums given by St.* Cyprian *to the Roman Church, as being the principal Church, the Church whence Unity of Faith and Diſcipline is derived to all other Chriſtian Churches*. If you indeed may have the liberty to interpret St. *Cyprians* words as you pleaſe, by adding ſuch things to them, of which there is no intimation in what he ſaith, you may make what you pleaſe unſuitable to them. For although he calls it *the principal Church, from whence the Unity of the Prieſthood is ſprung*; yet what is this to *the Unity of Faith and Diſcipline as derived from thence to all other Churches*, as you would perſwade the unwary reader that theſe were St. *Cyprians* words which are only your groundleſs interpretation of them. And therefore there is no ſuch improbability in what his Lordſhip ſays, *That this may be only a Rhetorical exceſs of ſpeech, in which St.* Cyprian *may* laudando præcipere, *by commending them to be ſuch, inſtruct them that ſuch indeed they ought to be, to whom perfidiouſneſs ſhould not get acceſs*. And for this he inſtanceth in ſuch another
Syneſ. ep. 67. *Rhetorical expreſſion* of *Syneſius* to *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*, wherein he tells him that he ought to eſteem *what his Throne ſhould determine as an Oracle or Divine Law*. And certainly this comes nearer Infallibility than that of St. *Cyprian* doth. But what inconveniency there ſhould be, that St. *Cyprian* by this interpretation ſhould give no more prerogative to the *Church of Rome*, than to that of *Alexandria* or *Antioch*, I cannot eaſily imagine, till you prove ſome greater *Infallibility* attributed then to the *Church* of *Rome*, than was to other *Apoſtolical Churches*: which as yet we are to ſeek for.

But at length (you tell us) *after much ado he grants* perfidia *may be taken*
Ibid. *for errour in Faith, or for perfidious misbelievers and Schiſmaticks, who had betrayed their Faith*; *but then* (ſay you) *he cavils with the word* Romanos. *This muſt be limited only to thoſe Chriſtians, who then lived in* Rome, *to whom* quâ tales, *as long as they continued ſuch, errour in Faith could not have acceſs*. What you ſay, his Lordſhip doth *at length and after much ado*, he did freely and willingly; but that you might have occaſion for thoſe words, you altered the courſe of his *anſwers*, and put the *ſecond* in the laſt place. But ſtill you have the unhappineſs to miſunderſtand him. For although he grants that *perfidia* may relate to *errour in Faith*, yet as it is here uſed, it is not underſtood of it *abſtractly* but *concretely*, for *perfidious misbelievers*, *i. e.* ſuch *perfidious perſons*, excommunicated out of other *Churches*, were not likely to get acceſs at *Rome*, or to find admittance into their communion.

nion. And in this ſenſe, it is plain that S. *Cyprian* did not intend by theſe words, to exempt the *Romans* from *poſſibility of error*, but to brand his adverſaries with a title due to their merit, calling them *perfidious*, *i. e.* ſuch as had betrayed or perverted the *Faith*. When you therefore ask, *is not this great praiſe?* I ſuppoſe none but your ſelf would make a queſtion of it, *viz.* that the *Church* of *Rome* had then ſo great *purity* as not to admit ſuch *perfidious miſbelievers* into her communion. And it were well if the preſent *Church* of *Rome* were capable of the ſame *praiſe*. But when you add, *It is as if S.* Cyprian *ſhould ſay S.* Peters *See could not err ſo long as it continued conſtant in the truth*; you wilfully miſunderſtand his Lordſhips meaning, who ſpeaks of the *perſons* and not meerly of their *errors*; but however, is it not a commendation to ſay that the *Church* of *Rome* conſiſted of ſuch *perſons* then who adhered to the *Apoſtolical Faith*, and therefore *error* could not have *acceſs* to them? And I look on it as ſo great a commendation, that I heartily wiſh it could be verified of your *Church* now. Neither is this any ſuch *Identical propoſition* as that you produce, but only a delaration of their preſent conſtancy, and inferring thence, how unlikely it was that *errors* ſhould de admitted by them. His Lordſhip to make it plain that S. *Cyprian* had no meaning to aſſert the unerring *Infallibility* of either *Pope* or *Church* of *Rome*, inſiſts on the conteſt which after happened between S. *Cyprian* and *Pope Stephen*; upon which he ſaith expreſly, *That Pope* Stephen *did not only maintain an error but the very cauſe of Hereticks, and that againſt Chriſtians and the very Church of God.* And after this he chargeth him, *with obſtinacy and preſumption*; *And I hope this is plain enough* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *to ſhew that S.* Cyprian *had no great opinion of the Roman Infallibility.* To this you anſwer, *With a famous diſtinction of the Popes erring as a private Doctor and as the Univerſal Paſtor, and that S.* Cyprian *might very well be ſuppoſed to think the Pope erred only in the firſt ſenſe.* Not to ſpend time in *rifling* this diſtinction of the *Popes erring perſonally*, but not *judicially*, or as a *private Doctor*, but not as *Univerſal Paſtor*, which it were an eaſie matter to do, by manifeſting the incongruity of it, and the abſurdities conſequent upon it, in caſe that *doctrine* which the *Pope errs* in, comes to be *judicially* decided by him; It is ſufficient for us at preſent to ſhew that this diſtinction cannot relieve you in our preſent caſe. For your *Doctors* tell us, the *Pope* then errs *perſonally* and as a *private Doctor*, when he errs only in his *own judgement* without *obliging* others to *believe*, what he judges to be *true*; but then he errs *judicially* and as *Univerſal Paſtor*, when he *declares* his *judgement* ſo as to *oblige* others to *receive* it as *true*. Now can any thing be more evident than that S. *Cyprian* judged *Pope Stephen* to err in this *latter* and not in the former ſenſe? For doth he not abſolutely and ſeverely declare himſelf againſt S. *Cyprians* opinion: condemning it as an *error* and an *innovation?* But ſay you, *He did not properly define any doctrine in that conteſtation*; *but ſaid* nihil innovetur niſi quod traditum. But was not that the queſtion what was *traditum* and what not, for *Cyprian* and his *party* denyed it to be a *tradition*, which *Stephen* aſſerted was ſo; and doth he not therefore undertake to define ſomething in this cauſe? But ſay you, *If this argument hold good againſt the Infallibility of Popes*, viz. *that S.* Cyprian *held Pope* Stephen *erred, therefore the Pope may err in matters of Faith*; *it will be a good conſequence alſo to ſay S.* Cyprian *held Pope* Stephen *erred, even whilſt he maintained an univerſal immemorial tradition* ——— *therefore the Pope may err whilſt he follows ſuch a tradition.* I anſwer, 1. Who beſides you, would not have

Stephanus frater noſter Hæreticorum cauſam contra Chriſtianos & contra Dei Eccleſiam aſſerere conatur. Cypr. ad Pompeium per Eraſm. Baſil. p. 327.

P. 134.

ſeen, that the queſtion was not, Whether the *Pope* was *Infallible* or no, but whether S. *Cyprian judged him to be Infallible* or no? for if it appear that S. *Cyprian* did not judge him *Infallible*, then thoſe former words cannot be interpreted to ſuch a ſenſe as doth imply Infallibility. 2. No doubt if the *Pope* may err in other things, he may *err* when he thinks he follows an *univerſal immemorial tradition*; not that he doth err, when he doth really follow ſuch a one, but he may err in *judging* that to be an *univerſal immemorial tradition* which is not: and this was the caſe between S. *Cyprian* and *Pope Stephen*; the *Pope* pretended to follow an *univerſal tradition*, S. *Cyprian* judgeth him to err in it, and that it was not ſo. And is it not plain ſtill, notwithſtanding theſe frivolous pretences, that S. *Cyprian* had no opinion at all of the *Popes Infallibility* in any ſenſe? and therefore out of honour to him, you are bound to interpret his former words to ſome other ſenſe than that of any *Infallibility* in the *Church* of *Rome*. Thus all his Lordſhips anſwers ſtanding good, you have gained no great matter by this firſt teſtimony of S. *Cyprian*.

The ſecond Authority is out of S. *Hierom*, whoſe words are, *The Roman Faith commended by the Apoſtle, admits not ſuch* præſtigiæ, *deceits and deluſions into it, though an Angel ſhould Preach it otherwiſe than it was Preached at firſt, being armed and fenced by S.* Pauls *Authority it cannot be changed.* Here you tell us, *You willingly agree with his Lordſhip that by* Romanam fidem, S. Hierom *underſtands the Catholick Faith of Chriſt*, and ſo you concur with him againſt *Bellarmine, that it cannot be underſtood of the particular Church of* Rome. But by the way you charge your Adverſaries, *with great inconſequence that in this place they make Roman and Catholick to be the ſame, and yet uſually condemn you for joyning as* Synonyma's *Roman and Catholick together.* A wonderful want of judgement! as though the *Roman Faith* might not be the *Catholick Faith* then, and yet the *Catholick Faith* not be the *Roman Faith* now. The former ſpeech only affirms that the *Faith* at *Rome* was *truly Catholick*; the latter implies that no *Faith* can be *Catholick* but what agrees with *Rome*: and think you there is no difference between theſe two? But you ſay further, *That this Catholick Faith* P. 135. *muſt not here be taken abſtractly that ſo it cannot be changed, for* Ruffinus *was not ignorant of that, but that it muſt be underſtood of the immutable Faith of the See Apoſtolick, ſo highly commended by the Apoſtle and S.* Hierom; *which is founded upon ſuch a rock, that even an Angel himſelf is not able to ſhake it.* But S. *Hierom* ſpeaking this with a reference to that *Faith* he ſuppoſeth the *Apoſtle* commended in them (although the *Apoſtle* doth not ſo much commend the *Catholickneſs* or ſoundneſs of their *Faith* as the *act of believing* in them, and therefore whatever is drawn from thence, whether by S. *Hierom* or any elſe can have no force in it; for if he ſhould infer the immutability of the Faith of the *Church* of *Rome* from ſo apparently weak a foundation, there can be no greater ſtrength in his teſtimony than there is in the ground on which it is built; and if there be any force in 1 Theſſ. 1. 8. this Argument, the *Church* of *Theſſalonica* will be as *Infallible* as *Rome*, for her Faith is commended rather in a more ample manner by the *Apoſtle* than that of *Rome* is) S. *Hierom*, I ſay, referring to that *Faith* he ſuppoſes the *Apoſtle* commended in them, muſt only be underſtood of the *unchangeableneſs of that firſt Faith*, which appears by the mention of *an Angel from Heaven Preaching otherwiſe.* Which certainly cannot with any tolerable ſenſe be meant thus, that S. *Hierom* ſuppoſed it beyond the power of an *Angel from Heaven to alter the Faith of the Roman Church.* For

Attamen ſcito Romanam fidem Apoſtolicâ voce laudatam eiuſmodi præſtigias non recipere, etiamſi Angelus aliter annunciet, quàm ſemel prædicatum eſt, Pauli authoritate munitam non poſſe mutari. Hieron. l. 3. Apol. c. Ruff. cap. 4.

in

in the very ſame *Apology* he expreſſeth his great fears, leſt the Faith of the *Romans* ſhould be corupted by the *Books* of *Ruffinus*. But, ſay you, *What is this then to* Ruffinus, *who knew as well as S.* Hierom, *that Faith could not change its eſſence?* However, though S. *Hierom* ſhould here ſpeak of the *Primitive* and *Apoſtolical Faith* which was then received at *Rome*, that this could receive no alteration; yet this was very pertinent to be told *Ruffinus*, becauſe S. *Hierom* charges him with an endeavour to ſubvert the *Faith* not meerly at *Rome*, but in all other places, by publiſhing the *Books* of *Origen* with an *Encomiaſtick Preface* to them; and therefore the telling him, *The Catholick Faith* would admit of no *alteration*, which was received at *Rome* as elſewhere, might be an Argument to diſcourage him from any *attempts* of that nature. And the main charge againſt *Ruffinus*, is not an endeavour to ſubvert merely the *people of Rome*, but the *Latin Church* by his tranſlation; and therefore theſe words ought to be taken in their greateſt latitude; and ſo imply not at all any *Infallibility* in the *Roman See*.

Non tibi ſufficit ſcandalum Græciæ, niſi illud & Latinorum auribus ingeras. Id. ib.

The remaining *Teſtimonies* of *Gregory Nazianzene*, *Cyril*, and *Ruffinus*, (as appears to any one who reads them) only import that the *Roman Church* had to their time preſerved the *Catholick Faith*; but they do not aſſert it impoſſible it ſhould ever do otherwiſe; or that ſhe is an *Infallible preſerver* of it, and none of their *Teſtimonies* are ſo proper to the *Church* of *Rome*, but they would equally hold for any other *Apoſtolical Churches* at that time. *Gregory Nazianzene* indeed ſayes, *That it would become the Church of* Rome *to hold the entire Faith always:* and would it not *become any other Church* to do ſo to? doth this import that ſhe ſhall *Infallibly* do it, or rather that it is her *duty* to do it? And if theſe then be *ſuch pregnant Authorities* with you, it is a ſign there is little or nothing to be found in *Antiquity* for your purpoſe. P. 136, 137.

§. 18.

But before we end this Chapter, we are called to a new task on occaſion of a Teſtimony of S. *Cyril* produced by his Lordſhip inſtead of that in *Bellarmine* which appeared not in that Chapter, where his *Name* is mentioned. In which he aſſerts, *That the foundation and firmneſs which the Church of Chriſt hath, is placed not in or upon the perſon, much leſs the Succeſſor of S.* Peter; *but upon the Faith which by Gods Spirit in him he ſo firmly profeſſed: which* (faith his Lordſhip) *is the common received opinion both of the ancient Fathers and of the Proteſtants. Upon this Rock, that is, upon this Faith will I build my Church.* On which occaſion you run preſently out into that large common place concerning *Tu es Petrus*, and *ſuper hanc Petram*; and although I ſhould grant all that you ſo earneſtly contend for, *viz. That theſe words are not ſpoken of S.* Peters *Confeſſion*, *but of his Perſon*, I know no advantage which will accrue to your cauſe by it. For although very many of the *Fathers* underſtand this place of S. *Peters Confeſſion*, as containing in it the ground and *Foundation* of *Chriſtian Religion*, *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the Living God*, which therefore may well be ſaid to be *the Rock* on which *Chriſt* would build his *Church*, and although it were no matter of difficulty to defend this interpretation from all exceptions; yet becauſe I think it not improbable (the words running by way of addreſs to S. *Peter*) that ſomething *peculiar* to him, is contained in them, I ſhall not contend with you about that. But then, if you ſay that the meaning of S. *Peters* being the *Rock*, is, *The conſtant Infallibility in Faith which was derived from S.* Peter *to the Church*

Petram opinor per agnominationem nihil aliud, quàm inconcuſſam & ſimiſſimam diſcipuli fidem vocavit; in quâ Eccleſia Chriſti ita fundata & firmata eſſet, ut non labaretur, & eſſet inexpugnabilis inferorum portis, in perpetuum manens. S. Cyril. Alex. Dial. de Trinit. l. 4. p. 278. Pariſ. A. 1604. P. 138, 139.

of Rome, as you ſeem to ſuggeſt, you muſt remember you have a new task to make good, and it is not ſaying, That S. *Peter* was meant by the *Rock*, will come within ſome *leagues* of doing it. I paſs therefore by that diſcourſe as a thing we are not much concerned in, for it is brought in by his *Lordſhip* as the laſt thing out of that teſtimony of *Cyril:* but you were contented to let go the other more material Obſervations, that you might more freely expatiate *ſuper hanc Petram.* Touching *Ruffinus*, I grant his Lordſhip is of opinion, *That he neither did nor could account the Roman*
P. 16. *Church Infallible*, for which he gives this reaſon, *For if he had ſo eſteemed of it, he would not have diſſented from it in ſo main a point as is the Canon of Scripture, as he plainly doth: For reckoning up the Canonical Books, he moſt manifeſtly diſſents from the Roman Church. Therefore either* Ruffinus *did not think the Church of* Rome *was Infallible, or elſe the Church of* Rome *at this day reckons up more Books within the Canon, than heretofore ſhe did. If ſhe do, then ſhe is changed in a main point of Faith, the Canon of Scripture, and is abſolutely convinced not to be Infallible; for if ſhe were right in her reckoning then, ſhe is wrong now; and if ſhe be right now, ſhe was wrong then; and if ſhe do not reckon now more than ſhe did, when* Ruffinus *lived, then he reckons fewer than ſhe, and ſo diſſents from her, which doubtleſs he durſt not have done, had he thought her judgement Infallible. Yea and he ſets this mark upon his diſſent beſides, that he reckons up the Books of the Canon juſt ſo, and no otherwiſe, than as he received them out of the Monuments of the fore-Fathers, and out of which the aſſertions of our Faith are to be taken.* Now what
Ruffin. in Symbol. p. 188, 189. P. 139. have you to ſay to this ſtrong and nervous Diſcourſe of his Lordſhip? *Why* (forſooth) *this argument of the Biſhop is far from being convincing.* And why ſo? *For* (ſay you) *though it ſhould be granted that the Catholick Church* (the Roman you mean) *at preſent declares more books to be contained in the Canon, than ſhe did in* Ruffinus *his time, yet this could be no error in her.* That is ſtrange, that the *Church* ſhould *declare* the *Canon* to be compleat then, without theſe *books*, and now not to be, and yet neither time be in an *error! No* (ſay you) *unleſs it be ſhewed* (*which I am ſure cannot be*) *that ſhe condemned thoſe books then as not Divine Scripture, or not Canonical, which now ſhe declares to be Divine or Canonical.* Excellent good ſtill! that which you are ſure *cannot be ſhewed*, is obvious to any one that hath *eyes* in his head. For I only ask you, Whether the *Church* of *Rome* did declare any *Canon* or no, in that age? If *not*, according to your principles thoſe who lived in that *age* could have no *Divine Faith* as to the *Scripture:* if ſhe did declare the *Canon* of *Scripture*, without theſe *Books*, did ſhe not thereby condemn theſe *Books* to be not *Canonical?* For you ſay, that all are bound to take her judgement what is in the *Canon* and what not; if therefore ſhe did not put them into the *Canon*, did ſhe not leave them out of the *Canon?* or, Can you find any *medium* between *being put in* and *being left out?* Yes (ſay you) *theſe Books were left then under diſpute:* with whom were they under diſpute? with the *Church* of *Rome* or not? If *with her*, was ſhe not *Infallible* the mean while, when ſo great a matter as the *Canon* of *Scripture* was *under diſpute* with her? But this whole buſineſs concerning the *Canon* of *Scripture* is largely diſcuſſed already; only here it is ſufficient to ſhew, how you are pent in on every ſide, ſo that there is no poſſibility of getting out.

As to the ſtrait (his Lordſhip takes notice of) *that the Church of* Rome *is driven to, in borrowing a teſtimony for her Infallibility from one whom ſhe branded with Hereſie in that very Book from whence this teſtimony is taken;* You anſwer, *That it evidently argues the truth and uncorruptedneſs of that Church, which is ſo clear that even her Adverſaries cannot but confeſs it.* But

if

if they confeſs it no better than *Ruffinus* doth, ſhe will have little cauſe to applaud her ſelf for her *Integrity* in that reſpect. And although a Teſtimony may be taken from perſons ſuſpected in ſome things, yet it argues thoſe have but very *few friends*, who are fain to make uſe of their *enemies* to bear witneſs for them. What follows concerning a *particular Church being Infallible*, becauſe you diſown it (although not conſonantly to the principles of your party as was ſhewed in the occaſion of the Conference) I paſs by. P. 140.

The errors of the *Church of Rome* (which his Lordſhip mentions, but you ſay *proves not*) you ſhall find abundantly proved before our task is over.

Your vindication of *Bellarmin* from inconſiſtency in ſaying *A propoſition is moſt true, and yet but peradventure as true as another*, is ſo fine and ſubtil that it were an injury to the Reader to deprive him of the pleaſure of peruſing it. And yet when all is done, *a Propoſition very falſe* might be *as true* as this which *Bellarmine* ſpeaks of, *viz. That the Pope when he teacheth the whole Church in matters of Faith cannot err.*

And thus I have cleared that there can be no ground of an imputation of *Schiſm* on our *Church* from hence, that the *Roman Church is the Catholick Church*, which acception of the *Catholick Church* I have manifeſted to be as great a ſtranger to *Antiquity* as it is an enemy to *Reaſon*: And that the calling the *Roman Church* the *Catholick Church*, is, (as his Lordſhip truly ſaith) *a meer Novelty* and *perfect Jeſuitiſm.*

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Proteſtants no Schiſmaticks.

Schiſm a culpable ſeparation; therefore the Queſtion of Schiſm, muſt be determined by enquiring into the cauſes of it. The plea from the Church of Rome*'s being once a right Church, conſidered. No neceſſity of aſſigning the punctual time when errors crept into her. An account why the originals of errors ſeem obſcure. By* Stapleton*'s confeſſion, the* Roman *and Catholick Church were not the ſame. The falſity of that aſſertion manifeſted, That there could be no pure Church ſince the Apoſtles times, if the* Roman *Church were corrupt. No one particular Church free from corruptions; yet no ſeparation from the Catholick Church. How far the Catholick Church may be ſaid to err. Men may have diſtinct communion from any one particular Church, yet not ſeparate from the Catholick Church. The Teſtimony of* Petrus de Alliaco *vindicated.* Bellarmine *not miſ-cited.* Almain *full to his Lordſhips purpoſe. The* Romaniſts *guilty of the preſent Schiſm, and not Proteſtants. In what ſenſe there can be no juſt cauſe of Schiſm; and how far that concerns our caſe. Proteſtants did not depart from the Church of* Rome, *but were thruſt out of it. The Vindication of the Church of* Rome *from Schiſm, at laſt depends upon the two falſe Principles, Of her Infallibility, and being the Catholick Church. The Teſtimonies of S.* Bernard *and S.* Auſtin *not to the purpoſe, The Catalogue of Fundamentals, the Churches not erring, &c. referr'd back to their proper places.*

§. 1. BEfore I come to examine the particulars of this Chapter, it will be neceſſary to ſee, what the ſtate of the Controverſie was, concerning Schiſm, between his Lordſhip and his Adverſary. His Lordſhip delivers his ſenſe clearly and fully in theſe words; *'Tis too true indeed, that there is*
P. 133. ſect. 21. n. 1. *a miſerable rent in the Church, and I make no queſtion but the beſt men do moſt bemoan it; nor is he a Chriſtian that would not have Unity, might he have it with Truth. But, I never ſaid, nor thought, that the Proteſtants made this rent. The cauſe of the Schiſm is yours; for you thruſt us from you, becauſe we call'd for truth, and redreſs of abuſes. For a Schiſm muſt needs be theirs, whoſe the cauſe of it is. The woe runs full out of the mouth of Chriſt ever againſt him that gives the offence; not againſt him that takes it ever.* And in the Margent, ſhewing *that a ſeparation may ſometimes be neceſſary,* he inſtanceth in *the orthodox departing from the communion of the* Arrians: upon which he ſays; *It cannot be that a man ſhould do well in making a Schiſm. There may be therefore a neceſſary ſeparation, which yet incurs not the guilt of Schiſm; and that is, when Doctrines are taught contrary to the Catholick*
P. 135. n. 3. *Faith.* And after ſaith, *The Proteſtants did not depart: for, departure is voluntary, ſo was not theirs; I ſay not theirs, taking their whole body and cauſe together. For, that ſome among them were peeviſh, and ſome ignorantly zealous, is neither to be doubted, nor is there danger in confeſſing it. Your body is not ſo perfect (I wot well) but that many amongſt you are as pettiſh and as*
P. 136. n. 4. *ignorantly zealous as any of ours. You muſt not ſuffer for theſe, nor we for thoſe, nor ſhould the Church of Chriſt for either.* And when *A. C.* ſaith, *That though the Church of* Rome *did thruſt the Proteſtants from her by excommunication, yet they had firſt divided themſelves by obſtinate holding and teaching Opinions contrary to the* Roman *Faith.* His Lordſhip anſwers, *So then in his Opinion, Excommunication on their part was not the prime cauſe of this diviſion, but the holding and teaching of contrary Opinions. Why but then in my opinion* (ſaith he) *that holding and teaching was not the prime cauſe neither*

ther, but the corruptions and ſuperſtitions of Rome, *which forced many men to hold and teach the contrary: So, the prime cauſe was theirs ſtill.* And *A. C.* telling him, *That he ſaid that it was ill done of thoſe who firſt made the ſeparation.* He anſwers, *That though he remembred not that he ſaid thoſe words; yet withal adds, If I did not ſay it then, I do ſay it now; and moſt true it is, That it was ill done of thoſe, whoe're they were, who firſt made the ſeparation. But then* A. C. *muſt not underſtand me of Actual only, but of Cauſal ſeparation. For (as I ſaid before) the Schiſm is theirs, whoſe the cauſe of it is: and he makes the ſeparation that gives the firſt juſt cauſe of it; not he that makes an actual ſeparation upon a juſt cauſe preceding. And this is ſo evident a Truth, that* A. C. *cannot deny it, for he ſays it is moſt true.* P. 142. n. 6.

Theſe paſſages I have laid together, that the Reader may clearly underſtand the full ſtate of this great Controverſie concerning *Schiſm*; the upſhot of which is, that it is agreed between both parties, that all ſeparation from communion with a *Church*, doth not involve in it the guilt of *Schiſm*, but only ſuch a ſeparation as hath no ſufficient *cauſe* or *ground* for it. So that the Queſtion comes to this, Whether your *Church* were not guilty of ſuch errours and corruptions, as gave ſufficient cauſe for ſuch a ſeparation. The Queſtion being thus ſtated, we now come to conſider how you make good your part in it.

§. 2.

Your firſt pretence is (if reduced into argument, for you ſeem to have a particular *pique* againſt a cloſe way of diſputing) *That your Church is a right and orthodox Church, and therefore could never give any juſt cauſe of ſeparation from it.* For the Lady asked (as *A. C.* would have it) *Whether the* Roman *Church was not the right Church; not, be not, but, was not;* that is, relating to the times, before the breach was made. P. 131. n. 5.

Now his Lordſhip tells him, *That as to the terms he might take his choice; For the Church of* Rome *neither is, nor was the right Church, as the Lady deſired to hear. A particular Church it is, and was, and in ſome times right, and in ſome times wrong: but the right Church, or the Holy Catholick Church, it never was, nor ever can be. And therefore was not ſuch before* Luther *and others left it, or were thruſt from it. A particular Church it was; but then* A. C. *is not diſtinct enough here neither. For the Church of* Rome, *both was, and was not a right or orthodox Church before* Luther *made a breach from it. For the word* ante, *before, may look upon* Rome, *and that Church a great way off, or long before; and then in the prime times of it, it was a moſt right and orthodox Church. But it may look alſo nearer home, and upon the immediate times before* Luther, *or ſome ages before that: and then in thoſe times* Rome *was a corrupt and tainted Church, far from being Right. And yet both theſe times, before* Luther *made his breach.* And ſo he concludes that Section with this clauſe, *That the* Roman *Church which was once right, is now become wrong, by embracing ſuperſtition and error.* And what ſay you now to all this? Two things you have to return in anſwer to it, or at leaſt to theſe two all that you ſay may be reduced. 1. *That if the* Roman *Church was right once, it is ſo ſtill.* 2. *That if the* Roman *Church were wrong before* Luther, *the Catholick Church was ſo too.* Theſe two containing all that is ſaid in this caſe, muſt be more particularly diſcuſſed.

1. *That if the* Roman *was the right Church, it ſtill is ſo, ſeeing no change can be ſhewn in her Doctrine. If there have been a change, let it appear when, and in what the change was made.* P. 142. Thus you ſay: but you know his Lordſhip never granted, that the *Roman* Church ever was *the right Church* (in the ſenſe you take thoſe words for the *true Catholick Church*;) that it was once a *right particular Church* he acknowledged, and as ſuch was afterwards tainted with errors and corruptions. If ſo, *you deſire to know what theſe were*, and *when they came in*; to the former I ſhall reſerve an Anſwer till I come to the third part of my task, where you ſhall have an account

account of them; to the latter, *the time when theſe came in*, becauſe this is ſo much inſiſted on by your party, I ſhall return you an Anſwer in this place. And that I ſhall do in theſe following Propoſitions.

1. *Nothing can be more unreaſonable, than to deny, that errors and corruptions have come into a Church, meerly becauſe the punctual time of their coming in cannot be aſſigned.* For, Will any one queſtion the birth of an Infant, becauſe he cannot know the time of his conception? Will any one deny there are tares in the field, becauſe he did not ſee them ſown? and our Saviour hath told us, That the *time of ſowing tares by the enemy, was, when the men were aſleep.* So we ſay, The errors and corruptions of your *Church* came in, in a time of great *Ignorance*, when little notice was taken of them, and few records preſerved of thoſe times and all the paſſages of them. Since Learning and Religion commonly decay and flouriſh together, How is it poſſible there ſhould be as exact an account given of the decay of Religion, as of the flouriſhing of it? Beſides, Are there not many things you judge errors and corruptions your ſelves, which you can give no account when they firſt entred into the *Church?* As the neceſſity of communicating Infants; name us the perſon who firſt broached that Doctrine, and the time in which it was firſt received in the Church? That no ſouls of men departed, ſhall ſee *God* till the day of reſurrection, is, I ſuppoſe, with you an error; yet it would puzzle you to find out the firſt Author of it. So for the rebaptizing Hereticks, and many things of a like nature, it is eaſier to ſhew, when they appeared publickly, than when they firſt came into the Church. And as evident is it, in the decay of the primitive Diſcipline of the *Church*, the altering the *orders* of *penitents*, and the *rites* belonging to them, the leaving off the *communicatory Letters* between *Churches*, and many other cuſtoms of the *Church* grown into diſuſe; and yet I ſuppoſe you will not preſume to name the perſons who firſt altered the former orders of the *Church*; and methinks, this is as reaſonable as the naming the punctual time when other corruptions came in. If you ſay, the Primitive *Diſcipline* decayed gradually and inſenſibly; ſo ſay I, that the *Churches* corruptions came in as the other went out, in the ſame gradual and inſenſible manner; and if you cannot name the preciſe time of the one, it is not reaſonable you ſhould expect the other from us.

Mat. 13. 25.

2. *We may have ſufficient reaſon to judge what are errors and corruptions in a Church, though we cannot fix on the time when they came in:* Which is, by comparing them with that Rule of Faith which is delivered down by an uninterrupted tradition to us, and with the practice of the firſt *Ages* of the *Chriſtian Church.* What is apparently contrary to either of theſe, we have reaſon to reject, though we cannot determine when it firſt came in. For as long as theſe are our certain *ſtandards*, it matters not who firſt departed from them, as long as we ſee that they have departed. But when we own an abſolute and infallible Rule of Faith and manners, to queſtion, Whether any thing contrary to it, be an error or no, becauſe we cannot tell when it firſt began, would be, as if the *Ægyptians*, when they ſaw their Land overflowed by the *Nile*, ſhould queſtion, Whether it were ſo or no, becauſe they could not find out the head of *Nilus*.

3. *They who aſſert their Doctrines and Practices to be Apoſtolical, are bound to ſhew the continued ſucceſſion of them from the Apoſtles times.* And if they fail in this, upon their own principles, they muſt be *errors* and *corruptions*, though the *punctual time* of their firſt obtaining in the Church, cannot be ſet down. Since therefore you *affirm*, you are bound to *prove*. If you ſay, The judgement of your *Church* being infallible, you need prove no more than that. I anſwer, you muſt prove that this *Infallibility* then, hath been ever received in the *Church*; but if there be not the leaſt footſtep of

it

it in the records of the ancient *Church*, we justly look on this as an *errour* of the *first magnitude*, though we cannot tell you the minute of its *first rising*.

4. *We have sufficient evidence from your selves, that many Doctrines and Practices are owned by you, which are of no great antiquity in the Christian Church.* Thus, by the confession of *Scotus*, *Transubstantiation* is no elder than the *Council* of *Lateran*, *Purgatory* not much heard of in the Primitive *Church* by the acknowledgement of *Bishop Fisher*, *Communion* in *one kind* confessed by most to be contrary to the primitive practice and institution, *Prayer in an unknown tongue* can be no elder than the general disuse of the *Latin tongue* in the *Roman Provinces*. And so for many others, for which we have the confessions of your own party; but I need not insist upon that, since your very Doctrine of the *Churches* power to declare matters of Faith, may make things *necessary* in one *Age*, which were not in a foregoing, and, in that case, sure it is no great difficulty to tell you, when some things of *School-points* became *necessary Doctrines*; but then the Question goes off from the *time* to the *matter*, Whether any thing declared by your *Church* can be an errour: but of that, enough hath been said already.

5. *There may be a sufficient account given, why the beginnings of errours and corruptions in your Church have been so obscure; because* they came not in all of a sudden, but some at one time, some at another, *because* they rise gradually, as is apparent in *Invocation* of *Saints*, and *Worship* of *Images*, *because* many of those things which ended in great *corruptions*, were taken up at first out of good designs, to win more upon the *Gentile* world, *because* many things were at first practised *freely*, which afterwards were urged as *necessary*; *because Barbarism* came into the *Church* along with these *corruptions*; *because* many who gave occasion to them, were persons of great esteem in their age, and others strove to follow their example more than the Rule; *because* the state of the *Church* did very much alter from it self in several ages, which altered mens apprehensions and judgements of things, in regard of their suitableness and necessity; *because* those persons who brought in, and contended for these things, were the persons chiefly in power then in the *Church*, which hindered their being cast out of communion as others had been; *because* a long time most of these errours and corruptions, were but the private opinions and practices of a faction, though then the more prevalent in the *Church*, and therefore not so vehemently opposed in the first *rise* of them, as when this imposthumated matter was grown to a head, and then there was a necessity of lancing it. These, and several other reasons might be given, why the first *originals* of *errours* and *corruptions* in your *Church*, cannot with so much clearness be manifested, as that they were errours and corruptions: Although such, who would take the pains to travel in an argument of that nature, might with very great prabability, trace the most both of your errours and corruptions to the time and age, when they were first publickly owned and received. But thus much may here suffice as to your demand, *That if your Church be not the same she was, we should mention the time, when the change was made.* As though *Chronical* distempers could not be known, unless we could set down the punctual *time* of their first *on-set*. The distempers of your *Church* are *Hectical*, I wish not in that respect, that *they are seldom fully discovered, till they be incurable.*

2. You answer, *That if your Church hath erred, the Catholick Church hath done so too*; for which you say two things. 1. *That in this dispute the* Roman *Church, and the Catholick Church, are all one.* 2. *That then there was no one visible Church untainted, uncorrupt, right, orthodox throughout the whole world.* 1. You learnedly tell us, *That the* Roman *and Catholick Church are all one in this dispute*, and most discreetly tell his Lordship, *That he beggs the Question* §. 3. P. 142. n. 1.

in ſuppoſing the contrary; but you know whoſe arts thoſe are to charge their neighbours with that, they were ſure to be told of themſelves, if the other had ſpoke firſt. But very worthily you prove this, from D. *Stapleton*, who offers to confirm his aſſertion by that which overthrows yours. He ſayes, *That amongſt the Ancients, the* Roman *Church, and the Catholick Church were taken for the ſame, and his reaſon is, becauſe the communion of the* Roman *Church was moſt certainly and evidently with the whole Catholick.* And, Can any thing then be more plain, than that the *Roman* and *Catholick Church* were not the ſame? For, Can any thing be the meaſure of it ſelf? If it were therefore *Catholick, becauſe* agreeing with the *Catholick Church*, then it was not *cauſally the Catholick Church*, but only by way of communion and participation. If I ſhould ſay, That a man and a living-creature are the ſame, and ſhould give this reaſon for it, Becauſe man agrees in every thing with the nature of a living creature; doth this imply, that the formal notion of man, and a living-creature, are the ſame? or only that man partakes ſo much of the properties of a living creature, that he may well receive the denomination? So it is here with the *Roman Church*, that might well be called *Catholick* by the *Ancients*, becauſe it did partake of the properties of the *Catholick Church*, but not as though the *formal Reaſon* of a *Churches* being *Catholick*, came from partaking of communion with the *Roman Church*; as you aſſert, wherein you are diametrically oppoſite to *Stapleton*, for he makes the reaſon, why the *Roman Church* was *Catholick*, to be, Becauſe it had communion with the *Catholick Church*. By which it is evident, that the notion of the *Catholick Church* was much larger than that of the *Roman Church*. Beſides, *Stapleton* only ſaith, *That the Ancients thought ſo*, and ſurely they thought ſo only of the *Roman Church* of their own time; which might then have certain Communion with the *Catholick Church*, and yet not have ſo in the next age enſuing; therefore, though the *Catholick Church* continue ever the ſame, and incorrupt, it will by no means follow, that the *Roman Church* muſt do ſo too. Whatever *A. C.* or you underſtand by the *Catholick Church*, is not, as you elſewhere phraſe it, a *ſtraws matter*, unleſs you proved better than you have done, that the proper notion of the *Holy Catholick Church*, is the ſame with *thoſe who agree with the Church of* Rome *in Doctrine and Communion.* Which is your fundamental miſtake, and a thing you would fain have taken for granted, without the leaſt ſhadow of a ſolid proof.

§. 4. P. 143. But there may be more force in your ſecond Anſwer, *That if the* Roman *Church were wrong and corrupted, it follows, that not only for ſome time, but for many ages before* Luther, *yea even up to the Apoſtles times, there was no one viſible Church untainted, uncorrupt, right, orthodox throughout the whole world.* It were worth our while to know what you mean by *no one Viſible Church*; Do you think there are, or may be, more *Viſible Churches* than one, taking the *Viſible Church* in its proper ſenſe for the *Catholick Viſible Church?* If this be your meaning in general, how unhappily ſoever it be expreſſed, *viz. that then it follows, there could be no Viſible Church at all with whom we might have communion*; I ſee not how it is proved by what you bring: But if this be all you aim at (for no further your arguments will carry you) that there was *no one Viſible Church untainted*, i. e. *no one Church of a diſtinct communion from other Churches* altogether free from errour; I ſee no ſuch dangerous conſequence in the owning it. But if it were ſo, when *Luther* began to oppoſe the *corruptions* of the *Church* of *Rome*, How doth it follow that it muſt be ſo *even up to the Apoſtles times?* But we ought to ſee, how you prove your aſſertion. *For if in all thoſe Ages the* Roman *Church were wrong, corrupted, and tainted; and all thoſe likewiſe that diſagreed from her*, viz. Huſſites, Albigenſes, Waldenſes, Wick-

Wicklevites, Greeks, Abyſſins, Armenians, &c. *had in them corrupt Doctrine during thoſe ages* (*as 'tis certain they had, neither could the Relator deny it*) *I ſay, If the* Roman *Church was thus corrupt; it follows, that not only for ſome time, but for many ages before* Luther, *yea even up to the Apoſtles times, there was no one Viſible Church untainted, incorrupt, right, and orthodox, throughout the whole world. And conſequently, that during the ſaid ages, every good Chriſtian was in conſcience obliged in ſome point of Chriſtian belief or other, to contradict the Doctrine, and deſert the communion of all Viſible Churches in the world,* &c. *Whence it would further follow, that Schiſm or ſeparation from the external communion of the whole Church might be not only lawful, but even neceſſary; which is impoſſible, as being contrary to the very eſſential predicates of Schiſm, which is defined to be, A voluntary or wilful departure* (*ſuch as no juſt cauſe, or reaſon, can be given of it*) *from the communion of the whole Church.* Three things this diſcourſe of yours may be reſolved into. 1. *That if in* Luthers *time the* Roman *Church was corrupt, then there was no one Viſible Church uncorrupt.* 2. *That if ſo, it follows that there was none uncorrupt even up to the Apoſtles times.* 3. *That if there were no one Viſible Church uncorrupt, then it was neceſſary to ſeparate from the external communion of the whole Church.* To every one of theſe I ſhall return a peculiar and diſtinct Anſwer. To the *firſt* I ſay, That the utmoſt you can prove from hence, is, That there was *no one Church of any diſtinct communion from others*, which was free from all errours. And what great abſurdity is there in ſaying ſo? Unleſs you could prove, that there muſt be *ſome one Church* in all ages of the world, which muſt be free from all kind or poſſibility of errour. And when you have done this, I ſhall acknowledge it abſurd to ſay the contrary; but otherwiſe that very ſuppoſition ſeems to have the greater abſurdity in it; becauſe it reſtrains the utmoſt ſuppoſable priviledges of the *truly Catholick Church*, to a *particular Church of ſome one denomination.* What then if we grant that in *Luther*'s time, there was *no one Viſible Church* free from errours and corruptions? What if we ſhould ſay, in our own times? What if, in elder times? For that which is poſſible to be, may be ſuppoſed actually in any time. If it be poſſible for one particular *Church* to fall into *errours* and *corruptions*, Why is it not for another? (unleſs ſome particular priviledge of *Infallibility* be pretended; but that is not our preſent Queſtion) If it be poſſible for every *particular Church* to fall into *errour*, Why may not that poſſibility come into act in one *Age*, as well as ſeveral? Is there any promiſe that there ſhall be a ſucceſſion and courſe of erring in *Churches*, that one *Church* muſt erre for one age, and another for the next? but that it ſhall never fall out, that by any means whatſoever they ſhall erre together? If there be no ſuch promiſe to the contrary, the reaſon of the thing will hold, that they may all erre at the ſame time. *No*, ſay you, *for then it would follow, that the Catholick Church might erre.* To that I anſwer, 1. Either you mean by that, that all ſocieties in the *Chriſtian world* may concurr in the ſame *errour*, or elſe that *ſeveral* of them may have ſeveral *errours*: and this latter is it only which you prove, for you do not ſuppoſe that the *Romaniſts*, *Huſſites*, *Albigenſes*, *&c.* were all guilty of the ſame *errours*, but that theſe ſeveral *ſocieties* were guilty of ſeveral *errours*; and therefore from hence it follows not, that they may all concurr in the ſame *errour*, which is the only way to prove that the *Church as Catholick* may erre, for otherwiſe you only prove, that the ſeveral particular *Churches*, which make up the *Catholick*, may fall into errour. 2. Suppoſing all theſe *Churches* ſhould agree in one errour, (which is more than you have proved, or, it may be, can) have you proved that they concurr in ſuch an *errour*, which deſtroies the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*? For you would do well to evince, that the Church is ſecured from any but ſuch errours

which deſtroy its Being; for the means of proving, That the *Catholick Church* cannot erre, are built on the promiſes of its *perpetuity*; now thoſe can only prove that the *Church* is ſecured from *Fundamental errours*, for thoſe are ſuch only which deſtroy its Being. And ſo his Lordſhip tells you,

P. 139. ſect. 18. n. 5. *That the whole Church cannot univerſally erre in the Doctrine of Faith, is moſt true, and granted by divers Proteſtants* (*ſo you will but underſtand its not erring in abſolute Fundamental Doctrines*) and this he proves, *from that promiſe of Chriſt, That the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* So that the *Catholick Church's* not erring, and the *perpetuity* of the *Catholick Church* do with us,

P. 141. mean the ſame thing. For his Lordſhip grants, *That ſhe may erre in ſuperſtructures, and deductions, and other By, and Unneceſſary truths, if her curioſity, or other weakneſs, carry her beyond, or cauſe her to fall ſhort of her Rule.* There is then a great difference between ſaying, *That the Catholick Church cannot erre*, which is no more than to ſay, *That there ſhall be always a Catholick Church*, and ſaying, *That there muſt be always ſome one Viſible Church*, which muſt be free from all errour and corruption. For this we deny, and you produce no reaſon at all to prove it. Granting, that all particular *Churches*, whether of *Romaniſts*, *Greeks*, or others, are ſubject to errours and corruptions, we aſſert no more of them, than you grant your ſelves, that any *particular Church* is ſubject to; for the only ground, why you would have your *Church* exempt from errour, is, the ſuppoſing her not to be a *particular*, but the *Catholick Church*, which implies, that if ſhe were only a *particular Church* (as ſhe is no more) ſhe might be ſubject to *errours* as well as other *Churches*. And what incongruity then there is in aſſerting, that there may be *no one Viſible Church* of any particular *denomination* free from all errour and corruption, I cannot underſtand.

§. 5. But further, you ſay, *If there were no one Viſible Church then free from errour, it follows, not only for ſome time, but for many ages before* Luther, *yea even up to the Apoſtles times, there was no one Viſible Church untainted throughout the whole world.* Not to meddle with the truth of the thing, Whether there were ſo or no, the conſequence is that, we are now to examine; that if it were ſo in *Luthers* time, it muſt be ſo *even up to the Apoſtles times*. The proof of which depends upon the impoſſibility of a *Churches* degeneracy in Faith or Manners, and ſo ſuppoſeth the thing in queſtion, that there muſt be ſome *one Viſible Church* abſolutely exempt from all impoſſibility of errour. For otherwiſe that might be *true* in one *age*, which might not in another. For although we ſay, that particular *Churches* may erre, and be corrupt, we do not ſay, that it is neceſſary they ſhould alwaies be ſo. For, in ſome ages particular *Churches* may be free from errour and corruption, and yet in another age be overſpread with them. And thus we aſſert it to have been with the *Roman Church*: for his Lordſhip ſaith, *In the prime times it was a moſt right and orthodox Church, but in the immediate times before* Luther, *or in ſome ages before, that it was a corrupt and tainted Church*: And ſo in thoſe times in which it was right, thoſe might be *heretical* who did not communicate with it, not meerly becauſe they did not communicate with it, but becauſe in not communicating with *a right and orthodox Church* they ſhewed themſelves guilty of ſome *errour* or *corruption*. We ſee then, there is no connexion in the world in the parts of your conſequence, *That if it were ſo at one time, it muſt be ſo alwaies; if in the time of* Luther, *it muſt be ſo even up to the Apoſtles times.*

3. From hence you ſay it will follow, *That it will be neceſſary to ſeparate from the external communion of the whole Church.* I anſwer, there can be no ſeparation from *the whole Church*, but in ſuch things wherein the *Unity* of the *whole Church* lyes; for *ſeparation* is a violation of ſome *Union*: now when men ſeparate from the *errours* of all particular *Churches*, they do

not

not ſeparate from *the whole*, becauſe thoſe things which one ſeparates from thoſe particular *Churches* for, are not ſuch, as make all them put together to be the *whole*, or *Catholick Church*. This muſt be ſomewhat further explained. There are two things conſiderable in all particular *Churches*; thoſe things which belong to it as *a Church*, and thoſe things which belong to it as *a particular Church*. Thoſe things which belong to it as *a Church*, are the common *ligaments* or grounds of union between all particular *Churches*, which taken together, make up the *Catholick Church*: Thoſe things which belong to it *as a particular Church*, are ſuch as it may retain the eſſence of a *Church* without. Now, I ſay, Whoſoever ſeparates from any particular *Church* (much more from all) for ſuch things without which that can be no *Church*, ſeparates from the communion of the *Catholick Church*; but he that ſeparates only from particular *Churches* as to ſuch things which concern not their *Being*, is only ſeparated from the *communion* of thoſe *Churches*, and not the *Catholick*. And therefore, ſuppoſing that all particular *Churches* have ſome errours and corruptions in them, though I ſhould ſeparate from *them all*, I do not ſeparate from the *communion* of the *whole Church*, unleſs it be for ſomething, without which thoſe could be no *Churches*. An evidence of which, is, that by my declaring the grounds of my ſeparation to be ſuch *errours* and *corruptions*, which are crept into the communion of ſuch *Churches*, and impoſed on me in order to it, I withall declare my readineſs to joyn with them again, if thoſe errours and corruptions be left out. And where there is this readineſs of *communion*, there is no abſolute ſeparation from the *Church* as ſuch, but only *ſuſpending communion* till ſuch abuſes be reformed. Which is therefore more properly a *ſeparation* from the *errours*, than the *communion* of ſuch a *Church*. Wherefore if we ſuppoſe that there is *no one Viſible Church*, whoſe communion is not tainted with ſome corruptions, though, if theſe *corruptions* be injoyned as conditions of communion, I cannot communicate with any of thoſe *Churches*, yet it follows not that I am ſeparated from the *external communion of the Catholick Church*, but that I only *ſuſpend communion* with thoſe particular *Churches*, till I may ſafely joyn with them. As, ſuppoſe all the particular men I can converſe with, were infected with *Leproſie*, my not aſſociating with them, doth not imply that I am ſeparated from the communion of all *mankind*, but that I am loth to be infected as they are, and therefore withdraw my ſelf till I can meet with ſuch healthful perſons with whom I may ſafely aſſociate again. And if ſeveral other perſons be of the ſame mind with me, and we therefore joyn together, Do we therefore divide our ſelves from the whole world by only taking care of our own ſafety? And eſpecially if any company of ſuch Leprous perſons ſhould reſolve that none ſhould live among them, but ſuch as would eat of thoſe meats which brought that diſtemper upon them; our withdrawing our ſelves, and aſſociating without them will ſtill appear more reaſonable and commendable. Therefore we ſay, We do not neceſſarily ſeparate from all *Churches* that have *errours* or corruptions in them, ſuppoſing thoſe errours and corruptions be not *impoſed* on us, as *conditions* of *communion*; and thence though we ſhould grant, *No one viſible Church* free from taint or corruption, yet it is not neceſſary we ſhould ſeparate from them all: For we may lawfully joyn in Communion with *Churches* having errours and corruptions, if our joyning be not an approbation of them. Thus though the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Albigenſes*, *Abyſſins* may have ſome errours, or corruptions, yet if they be not fundamental, and be not injoyned as neceſſary to be approved in order to their Communion, notwithſtanding them, we may lawfully Communicate with them. It doth not then at all follow, that if there may be *no one viſible Church* free from errour and corruption, it would be neceſſary to ſeparate from

from the *Communion of the Catholick Church:* becauſe, 1. All thoſe particular *Churches* may not make thoſe errours conditions of Communion. 2. Though they did, we ſeparate not from them as *Catholick*, but as corrupt and erroneous *particular Churches*. And therefore you might have ſpared your labour in telling us from the *Holy Fathers*, and the Reverend and learned Dr. *Hammond*, *That it can never be lawful to ſeparate from the Catholick Church*, for we aſſert the ſame, but have made it appear that it follows not from the premiſes which were laid down.

§. 6. His Lordſhip having ſaid, *That the Roman Church before* Luther *was a corrupt and tainted Church*, in his Margin produceth a Citation to that purpoſe of *Cardinal de Alliaco*, who acknowledgeth *infinite abuſes, Schiſms and Hereſies to prevail over the Chriſtian world; ſo that it is plain, The Church of God ſtands in need of due reformation.* From which his Lordſhip ſaith, *That it will hardly ſink into any mans judgement that ſo great a man, as* Pet. de Alliaco *was in that Church, ſhould ſpeak thus, if he did not ſee ſome errours in the Doctrine of that Church as well as the manners.* To this you anſwer, *That he ſpeaks not of falſe Doctrines taught by the Roman Church, but of Schiſms and Hereſies raiſed againſt the Church (not foſtered by her) in all parts of Chriſtendom.* But I appeal to any indifferent Reader of this Teſtimony, whether he can conceive that the *Cardinal* intended to acquit or accuſe the *Roman Church* in thoſe words of his. For taking them in your ſenſe, they muſt contain a high *commendation* of the *Roman Church*, that in the midſt of ſo many *Hereſies* and *Schiſms* raiſed againſt her, ſhe preſerved her Faith entire; and think you that he that ſaid, The *Church of God* needed reformation, thought there was nothing in the *Church* which ſtood in need of it? And therefore this Teſtimony doth ſufficiently prove that the *Roman Church* was a tainted and corrupted *Church*.

Cùm infiniti abuſus, Schiſmata quoq; & hereſes, per totum nunc Chriſtianum orbem invaleſcant; Eccleſiam Dei legitimâ indigere reformatione, nemini non apertum erit. Petrus de Alliaco lib. de Reform. Eccleſ.

P. 143.

If there be ſufficient evidence, *that there are tares ſown in the Church of* Rome, it is not to much purpoſe to enquire Whether they were ſown *while the Biſhops ſlept*, or whether *they themſelves did not help to ſow them.* But it ſeems *in their private capacities they might ſow them, as private Doctors*, and then it is not likely that in their publick capacity they would pluck them up. *If the Catholick Faith only*, as you tell us, *oblige us to maintain that the Pope is Infallible when he defines a General Council*; then there will be opportunity enough for errours to be ſown, and grow up in the interval of ſuch definitions. But you further add, *That though this be all which men are obliged to maintain* (for no man can be bound to impoſſibilities) *yet that it is a very pious opinion to hold, That no Popes have perſonally erred as private Doctors, i. e.* you have a very good mind to maintain it, if you knew how; for that is the meaning of your pious opinion. For if you thought it had been defenſible, no doubt it had been *de fide* long ago. But it was hard thwarting the Records of former ages wherein the *errours* of *Popes*, and their mutual contradictions are ſo viſible to all that ſearch after them, and therefore it was wiſely concluded that this ſhould not be held *de fide*, but, if any would venture upon a thing ſo acceptable at *Rome* as Perſonal Infallibility is, it ſhould be accounted a very *pious* undertaking. And accordingly *Bellarmin* hath with the greateſt care and induſtry endeavoured it in ſeveral Chapters; but, as his Lordſhip truly ſaith, *All* Bellarmin's *labour though great and full of art, is not able to waſh them clean.* And this (if you had undertaken the defence of *Bellarmin*) ſhould have been made good; but ſince you are ſo cautious as not to think your ſelf obliged to do it. I commend your diſcretion in it, and proceed. I cannot ſee that his Lordſhip is guilty of a falſe quotation of *Bellarmin* for that ſaying, *Et Papas quoſdam graves errores ſeminâſſe in Eccleſiâ Chriſti, luce clarius eſt*, for he doth not ſeem at all to Cite *Bellarmin* for

for it; but having Cited the place juſt before, where he endeavours to vindicate the *Popes* from all *errours*; he adds this expreſſion, as directly contrary to his deſign, that though he had endeavoured ſo much to clear them from errours, yet that they had ſown ſome grievous errours in the *Church* was as clear as the day; and as it immediately follows is proved by *Jac. Almain*, &c. And therefore it was only your own oſcitancy which made you ſet it in the Contents of your Chapter, *That Cardinal* Bellarmin *was moſt falſly quoted by him.* But that falſeneſs which with ſo much confidence you charge his Lordſhip with, rebounds with greater force on your ſelf, when you ſay, *That* Almain *ſpeaks not of errours in Faith at all, but only of errours, or rather abuſes in point of manners*; whereas he not only aſſerts but largely proves, *That the Pope may erre, not only perſonally but judicially*, and in the ſame Chapter brings that remarkable Inſtance of the evident contradiction between the definitions of *Pope Nicolaus* 3. and *John* 22. And *Platina* tells us, that *John* 22. *declared them to be Hereticks who held according to the former definition.* And, Is this only concerning ſome abuſes in point of manners, and not concerning errours in Faith that *Almain* ſpeaks? You might as well ſay ſo of *Lyra*, who ſaid, *That many Popes have Apoſtatized from the Faith*; of *Cuſanus*, who ſaith, *That both in a direct and collateral line, ſeveral Popes have fallen into Hereſie*; of *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, who ſaith, *That the beſt friends of the Popes believe they may erre in Faith*; of *Carranza*, who ſayes, *No one queſtions but the Pope may be an Heretick*; of *Canus*, who ſayes, *It is not to be denyed but that the chief Biſhop may be an Heretick, and that there are examples of it:* You might as well, I ſay, affirm that all theſe ſpake only of abuſes in Manners, and not errours in Faith, as you do of *Almain.* Neither will your other ſubterfuge ſerve your turn, *That they taught errours in Doctrine as private men*; for, *Alphonſus à Caſtro* expreſly affirms in the caſe of *Pope Cœleſtine*, about the diſſolution of Marriage in caſe of Hereſie, *That it cannot be ſaid that he erred through negligence, and as a private perſon, and not as Pope*; *For* (ſaith he) *this definition is extant in the decretals, and he had ſeen it himſelf.* Although the contrary to this were afterwards defined not only by Pope *Innocent* 3. but by the *Council of Trent.* And hence it appears whatever you pretend to the contrary, *That there may be tares ſown in the Church of* Rome, *not only by private perſons, but by the publick hands of the Popes too,* if they themſelves may be believed, who elſe do moſt Infallibly contradict each other. But whether theſe errours came in at firſt through negligence or publick definitions is not ſo material to our purpoſe; for which it is ſufficient to prove that the *Church* of *Rome* may be tainted and corrupted, which may be done one way as well as the other. As Corn-fields may be over-run with tares though no one went purpoſely to ſow them there. And ſo much is acknowledged by *Caſſander* when he ſpeaks of the ſuperſtitious practices uſed in your Church, *That thoſe who ſhould have redreſſed thoſe abuſes, were, if not the Authors, yet the incouragers of them for their own advantage*; by which means, errours and corruptions may ſoon grow to a great height in a *Church* though they were never ſown by publick definitions. And when you diſparage *Caſſander*'s Teſtimony, by telling us how little his credit is among *Catholicks*, you thereby let us ſee how much your *Church* is over-run with corruptions, when none among you can ſpeak againſt them but they preſently forfeit their reputation.

Papa poteſt errare, errore judiciali; de perſonali, omnibus notum eſt. Jac. Almain. de auctorit. Eccleſ. cap. 10.

Quorum unus determinavit, judicialiter, Chriſtum & Apoſtolos nihil habuiſſe in communi nec in proprio; alter, oppoſitum. Id. ib.

Lyra in Matth. 16. Cuſan. Concord. l. 1. c. 14. Alphonſ. c. hæreſ. l. 1. c. 2. Carranz. Controv. 4. Canus loc. Com. l. 6. c. ult.

De hæreſ. l. 1. c. 4.

P. 144.

Caſſand. Conſult. art. 21.

The caſe of the *Schiſm* at *Rome* between *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, and the imployment of *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus* from St. *Cyprian* thither, doth belong to the former Chapter, where it hath been fully diſcourſed of already,

N. 3.

already, and must not be repeated here. Only thence we see that *Rome* is as capable of a *Schism* within her own bowels as any other *Church* is, which is abundantly attested by the multitudes of *Schisms*, which happened afterwards between the *Bishops* of that *See*. But this being insisted on by his Lordship in the former Controversie of the *Catholick Church*, doth not refer to this Chapter wherein the *causes* of our *separation* should be enquired into.

§. 7. N. 4. *ibid.* Which at last you come to, and *passing by the verbal dispute between* A. C. *and his Lordship about what was spoken at the Conference*, you tell us, *It more concerns you to see what could or can be said in this point*. You draw up therefore a large and formal charge of *Schism* against us in your following words. *Our assertion*, say you, *is*; but, good *Sir*, it is not what you *assert*, but what you *prove*. It were an easie matter for us to draw up a far larger Bill against your *Church*, and tell you *our assertion is*, that you are the greatest *Schismaticks* in the world. Would you look on it as sufficiently proved because we asserted it? I pray think the same of us, for we are not apt to think our selves guilty of *Schism* at all the more, because you tell us what *your assertion is*; if this be your way of dealing with us, your first *assertion* had need be, That you are Infallible; but still that had need be more than asserted, for unless it be Infallibly proved we should not believe it. But however, we must see what *your assertion is*, that we may at least understand

P. 145. from you the state of the present Controversie. *Your assertion therefore is, that Protestants made this rent or Schism, by their obstinate and pertinacious maintaining erroneous Doctrines, contrary to the Faith of the Roman or Catholick Church: by their rejecting the Authority of their lawful Ecclesiastical Superiors both immediate and mediate; by aggregating themselves into a separate body or company of pretended Christians, independent of any Pastours at all, that were in lawful and quiet possession of jurisdiction over them; by making themselves Pastours and Teachers of others, and administring Sacraments without Authority given them by any that were lawfully impowr'd to give it; by instituting new rites and ceremonies of their own in matter of Religion, contrary to those antiently received throughout all Christendome; by violently excluding and dispossessing other Prelates and Pastours of and from their respective See's, Cures, and Benefices; and intruding themselves into their places in every Nation where they could get footing, the said Prelates and Pastours for the most part yet living.* These are your assertions, and because you seek not to prove them, it shall be sufficient to oppose ours to them. Our assertion therefore is, that the *Church* and *Court* of *Rome* are guilty of this *Schism*, by obtruding erroneous Doctrines and superstitious practices, as the conditions of her *Communion*; by adding such *Articles* of *Faith* which are contrary to the plain rule of Faith, and repugnant to the sense of the truly *Catholick* and not the *Roman Church*; by her intolerable incroachments and usurpations upon the liberties and priviledges of particular *Churches*, under a vain pretence of *Universal Pastorship*; by forcing men if they would not damn their souls by sinning against their consciences in approving the errours and corruptions of the *Roman Church*, to joyn together for the Solemn Worship of *God* according to the rule of *Scripture* and practice of the *Primitive Church*; and suspending Communion with that *Church* till those abuses and corruptions be redressed. In which they neither deny obedience to any Lawful *Authority* over them, nor take to themselves any other Power than the *Law* of *God* hath given them, receiving their Authority in a constant Succession from the *Apostles*: they institute no Rites and Ceremonies either contrary to, or different from the practice of the Primitive *Church*; they neither exclude or dispossess others of their Lawful Power, but in case others neglect their office, they may be notwithstanding obliged to perform theirs in order to

the

the *Churches Reformation.* Leaving the *Supreme Authority* of the Kingdom or *Nation* to order and diſpoſe of ſuch things in the *Church* which of right appertain unto it. And this we aſſert to be the caſe of *Schiſm*, in reference to the *Church of England*, which we ſhall make good in oppoſition to your aſſertions, where we meet with any thing that ſeems to contradict the whole or any part of it. *Theſe and the like practices of yours* (to uſe your own words) *not any obſtinate maintaining any erroneous Doctrines*, as you vainly pretend, we aver to have been the true and real cauſes of that ſeparation which is made between your Church and ours. And you truly ſay, *That Proteſtants were thruſt out of your Church*; which is an Argument they did not voluntarily forſake the Communion of it and therefore are no *Schiſmaticks*; but your carriage and practices were ſuch as forced them to joyn together in a diſtinct Communion from you. And it was not we who left your *Church*, but your *Church* that left her Primitive Faith and Purity in ſo high a manner, as to declare all ſuch excommunicate who will not approve of and joyn in her greateſt corruptions, though it be ſufficiently manifeſt that they are great receſſions from the Faith, Piety, and Purity of that *Roman Church* which was planted by the *Apoſtles*, and had ſo large a commendation from the Apoſtolical men of thoſe firſt ages. Since then ſuch errors and corruptions are enforced upon us as conditions of Communion with you, by the ſame reaſon that the *Orthodox* did very well in departing from the *Arrians*, becauſe the *Arrians* were already departed from the *Church* by their falſe Doctrine; will our ſeparation from you be juſtified who firſt departed from the Faith and Purity of the Primitive *Church*; and not only ſo, but thruſt out of your *Communion* all ſuch as would not depart from it as far as you.

Having thus conſidered and retorted your Aſſertions, we come to your Anſwers. *Nor* (ſay you) *does the Biſhop vindicate the Proteſtant party, by ſaying, The cauſe of Schiſm was ours, and that we Catholicks thruſt Proteſtants from us, becauſe they call'd for truth and redreſs of abuſes. For firſt, there can be no juſt cauſe of Schiſm; this hath been granted already even by Proteſtants.* And ſo it is by us, and the reaſon is very evident for it, for if there be a *juſt cauſe*, there can be no *Schiſm*; and therefore what you intend by this, I cannot imagine, unleſs it be to free *Proteſtants* from the guilt of *Schiſm*, becauſe they put the Main of their tryal upon the juſtice of the *cauſe* which moved them to forſake the Communion of your *Church*; or elſe you would have it taken for granted that ours was a *Schiſm*, and thence infer there could be no juſt *cauſe* of it. As if a man being accuſed for taking away the life of one who violently ſet upon him in the High-way with an intent both to rob and deſtroy him, ſhould plead for himſelf that this could be no murther in him, becauſe there was a ſufficient and juſtifiable cauſe for what he did; that he deſigned nothing but to go quietly on his road; that this perſon and ſeveral others violently ſet upon him; that he intreated them to deſiſt, that he ſought to avoid them as much as he could, but when he ſaw they were abſolutely bent on his ruine, he was forced in his own neceſſary defence to take away the life of that perſon; Would not this with any intelligent Jury be looked on as a juſt and reaſonable Vindication? But if ſo wiſe a perſon as your ſelf had been among them, you would no doubt have better informed them; for you would very gravely have told them, All his plea went on a falſe ſuppoſition, that he had a *juſt cauſe* for what he did, but there could be *no juſt cauſe for murther.* Do you not ſee now how ſubtil and pertinent your Anſwer is here, by this parallel to it? For as in that caſe all men grant that there can be *no juſt cauſe for murther*, becauſe all murther is committed without a juſt cauſe; and if there be one, it ceaſeth to be

§. 8. P. 145.

murther: So it is here in *Schiſm*, which being a *cauſeleſs ſeparation* from the *Churches Unity*, I wonder who ever imagined there could be *juſt cauſe* for it. But to rectifie ſuch groſs miſtakes as theſe are for the future, you would do well to underſtand that *Schiſm* formally taken always imports ſomething criminal in it, and there can be no juſt cauſe for a *ſin*; but beſides that, there is that which (if you underſtand it) you would call the *materiality* of it which is the *ſeparation* of one part of the *Church* from another. Now this, according to the different grounds and reaſons of it, becomes *lawful* or *unlawful*, that is, as the reaſons do make it neceſſary or unneceſſary, For ſeparation is not *lawful* but when it is *neceſſary*: now this being capable of ſuch a different nature that it may be *good* or *evil* according to its circumſtances, there can be no abſolute judgement paſſed upon it, till all thoſe reaſons and circumſtances be duely examined; and if there be no ſufficient grounds for it, then it is *formally Schiſm*, *i. e.* a culpable ſeparation; if there be ſufficient *cauſe*, then there may be a *ſeparation*, but it can be no *Schiſm*. And becauſe the *Union* of the *Catholick Church* lyes in *Fundamental* and *neceſſary truths*, therefore there can be no ſeparation abſolutely from the *Catholick Church* but what involves in it the formal guilt of *Schiſm*; it being impoſſible any perſon ſhould have juſt cauſe to diſown the *Churches* Communion for any thing whoſe belief is neceſſary to ſalvation. And whoſoever doth ſo, thereby makes himſelf no member of the *Church*, becauſe the *Church* ſubſiſts on the belief of Fundamental truths But in all ſuch caſes wherein a diviſion may be made, and yet the ſeveral perſons divided retain the *eſſentials* of a *Chriſtian Church*, the ſeparation which may be among any ſuch, muſt be determined according to the cauſes of it. For it being poſſible of one ſide, that men may out of capricious humours and fancies renounce the Communion of a *Church* which requires nothing but what is juſt and reaſonable; and it being poſſible on the other ſide, that a *Church* calling her ſelf *Catholick* may ſo far degenerate in Faith and practice, as not only to be guilty of great errors and corruptions, but to impoſe them as conditions of Communion with her, it is neceſſary where there is a manifeſt ſeparation to enquire into the reaſons and grounds of it; and to determine the nature of it according to the juſtice of the cauſe which is pleaded for it. And this I hope may help you a little better to underſtand, what is meant by ſuch, who ſay, *There can be no juſt cauſe of Schiſm*; and how little this makes for your purpoſe.

§. 9. But you go on and I muſt follow. *And to his calling for truth*, &c. *I Anſwer, What Hereticks ever yet forſook the Church of God, but pretended truth, and complained they were thruſt out, and hardly dealt with, meerly becauſe they called for truth and redreſs of abuſes?* And I pray, what *Church* was ever ſo guilty of errors and corruptions, but would call thoſe *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks* who found fault with her Doctrine, or ſeparated from her Communion? It is true, *Hereticks pretend truth, and Schiſmaticks abuſes*, but is it poſſible there ſhould be *errors* and corruptions in a *Churches* Communion, or is it not? If not, prove but that of your *Church*, and the cauſe is at an end; if it be, we are to examine whether the charge be true or no. For although *Hereticks may pretend truth*, and others be deceived in judging of it, yet doubtleſs there is a real difference between *truth* and *error*. If you would never have men quarrel with any Doctrine of your *Church* becauſe *Hereticks have pretended truth*: would not the ſame reaſon hold, why men ſhould never enquire after *Truth*, *Reaſon*, or *Religion*, becauſe *men have pretended* to them all which have not had them. It is therefore a moſt ſenſeleſs cavil to ſay we have no reaſon *to call for truth* becauſe *Hereticks have done ſo*; and on the ſame grounds you muſt not be

called

called *Catholicks* becauſe *Hereticks* have been called ſo. But thoſe who have been *Hereticks* were firſt proved to be ſo, by making it appear that was a certain *truth* which they denyed; do you the ſame by us; prove thoſe which we call *errors* in your *Church* to be part of the *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Faith*; prove thoſe we account *corruptions*, to be parts of *Divine worſhip*, and we will give you leave to call us *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, but not before. *But*, ſay you, *He ſhould have reflected that the Church of God is ſtiled a City of Truth by the Prophet*, (and ſo it may be, and yet your Church be a fortreſs of Error) *And a Pillar and foundation of Truth by the Apoſtle*, (but what is this to the Church of *Rome* being ſo?) *And by the Fathers, a rich depoſitory or Treaſury of all Divine and Heavenly Doctrines* (ſo it was in the ſenſe the Fathers took the *Church* in, for the *truly Catholick Chriſtian Church*). And we may uſe the ſame expreſſions ſtill of the *Church* as the *Prophets*, *Apoſtles*, and *Fathers* did, and nevertheleſs charge your *Church* juſtly *with the want of truth, and oppoſition to the preaching of it, and on that ground* juſtly *forſake her Communion*, which is ſo far from being *inexcuſable impiety and preſumption*, that it was only the performance of a neceſſary Chriſtian duty. And therefore that *Woe of ſcandal*, his Lordſhip mentioned, ſtill returns upon your party who gave ſuch juſt cauſe of offence to the *Chriſtian* world, and making it neceſſary for all ſuch as aimed at the purity of the *Chriſtian Church* to leave your Communion, when it could not be enjoyed without making ſhipwrack both of Faith and a good Conſcience. *And this is ſo clear and undeniable* (to follow you ſtill in your own language) that we dare appeal for a tryal of our cauſe *to any Aſſembly of learned Divines*, or what *Judge* and *Jury* you pleaſe, provided they be not ſome of the parties accuſed; and becauſe you are ſo willing to have *Learned Divines*, I hope you will believe the laſt *Pope Innocent* ſo far, as not to mention the *Pope* and *Cardinals*.

What follows in Vindication of *A. C.* from *enterfering and ſhuffling in his words, becauſe timorous and tender conſciences think they can never ſpeak with caution enough, for fear of telling a lye*, will have the force of a demonſtration, (being ſpoken *of* and *by* a *Jeſuit*) among all thoſe who know what mortal haters they are of any thing that looks like a lye or æquivocation: And what reaſon there is that, of all perſons in the world, they ſhould be judged *men of timorous and tender Conſciences*. P. 146.

But whatever the words were which paſſed, you juſtifie *A. C.* in ſaying, *That the Proteſtants did depart from the Church of* Rome, *and got the Name of Proteſtants by proteſting againſt her. For this* (ſay you) *is ſo apparent that the whole world acknowledgeth it.* If you mean that the Communion of *Proteſtants* is diſtinct from yours, Whoever made ſcruple of confeſſing it? But becauſe in thoſe terms of *departing*, *leaving*, *forſaking* your Communion, you would ſeem to imply that it was a *voluntary act* and done without any neceſſary *cauſe* enforcing it, therefore his Lordſhip denyes *that Proteſtants did depart*; *for*, ſaith he, *departure is voluntary, ſo was not theirs.* But becauſe it is ſo hard a matter to explain the nature of that ſeparation between your *Church* and Ours, eſpecially in the beginning of it, without uſing thoſe terms or ſome like them, as when his Lordſhip ſaith, *that* Luther *made a breach from it*: It is ſufficient, that we declare that by none of theſe expreſſions we mean any *cauſleſs ſeparation*, but only ſuch acts as were neceſſarily conſequential to the impoſing your errors and corruptions as conditions of Communion with your *Church*. To the latter part his Lordſhip anſwers, *That the Proteſtants did not get that name, by Proteſting againſt the Church of* Rome, *but by Proteſting* (*and that when nothing elſe would ſerve*) *againſt her errors and ſuperſtitions. Do you but remove them from the Church of* Rome, *and our Proteſtation is ended and our Separation too.* §. 10. P. 135. n. 3.

This, you think, will be anſwered with our old put off, *That it is the common pretext of all Hereticks, when they ſever themſelves from the* Roman-*Catholick Church.* If your *Church* indeed were what ſhe is not, the *Catholick Church*, we might be what we are not, *Hereticks*: but think it not enough to prove us *Hereticks*, that you call us ſo, unleſs you will likewiſe take it for granted, that the *Pope* is *Antichriſt*, and your *Church*, *the Whore of* Babylon, becauſe they are as often, and as confidently called ſo. And if your *Church* be truly ſo (as ſhe is ſhrewdly ſuſpected to be) Do you think ſhe, and all her followers, would not as confidently call ſuch as diſſented from her, *Hereticks*, and the uſing thoſe expreſſions of her *virulent execrations againſt her*, as you do now, ſuppoſing her not to be ſo? What therefore would belong to your *Church*, ſuppoſing her as bad as any *Proteſtants* imagine her to be, cannot certainly help to perſwade us, that ſhe is not ſo bad as ſhe is. When you ſay ſtill, That *Proteſtants did really depart from the* Roman *Church, and in ſo doing, remained ſeparate from the whole Church*; you very fairly beg the thing in diſpute, and think us uncivil for denying it. You know not what that paſſage means, *That the Proteſtants did not voluntarily depart, taking their whole body and cauſe together*; ſince there is no obſcurity in the expreſſion, but a defect elſewhere, I can only ſay, That his Lordſhip was not bound to find you an *Underſtanding* as oft as you want it. But it were an eaſie matter to help you; for it is plain, that he ſpeaks thoſe words to diſtinguiſh the *common cauſe of Proteſtants*, from the heats and irregularities of ſome *particular perſons*, whom he did not intend to juſtifie, ſuch as he ſaith, *Were either peeviſh, or ignorantly zealous.* And if you diſtinguiſh the ſenſe of your *Church* from the judgements of particular perſons, I hope it may be as lawful for us to diſtinguiſh *the body and cauſe of Proteſtants* from the inconſiderate *actings* of any *particular men.* All that which follows about the name of *Proteſtants*, which his Lordſhip ſaith, *Took its riſe, not from proteſting ſimply againſt the* Roman *Church, but againſt the Edict at* Worms, *which was for the reſtoring all things to their former ſtate, without any reformation*, is ſo plain and evident, that
P. 147. nothing but a mind to cavil, and to give us the ſame things over and over, could have made you ſtay longer upon it. For what elſe means your talk of *Innovation in matters of Religion* (which we ſay, was cauſed by you) *and proteſting againſt the* Roman *Church, and conſequently againſt all particular Viſible Churches in the world, and that which none but Hereticks and Schiſmaticks uſed to do?* Do you think theſe paſſages are ſo hard, that we cannot know what they mean, unleſs we have them ſo often over? But they are not ſo hard to be underſtood, as to be believed, and that the rather, becauſe we ſee you had rather *ſay* them *often*, than *prove* them *once.* If *the Popes profeſſed Reformation neceſſary as to many abuſes*, I hope they are not all *Schiſmaticks* who call for the redreſs of abuſes in your *Church.* But, if all the Reformation we are to expect of them, be that, which you ſay, *was effectually ordained by the Council of* Trent, if there had not been an *Edict* at *Worms*, there were the *Decrees* of that *Council* which would have made a *Proteſtation neceſſary.* Although we think your *Church* needs *Reformation in Manners and Diſcipline*, as much as any in the world, yet thoſe are not the *abuſes* mainly inſiſted on by the *Proteſtants*, as the grounds of their *Separation*, and therefore his Lordſhip ought to be underſtood, of a *Reformation as to the errors and corruptions of the* Roman *Church*; and doubtleſs that *Edict* of *Worms* which was for the *reſtoring all things to their former ſtate*, did cut off all hopes of any ſuch *Reformation* as was neceſſary for the *Proteſtants* to return to the *Roman Communion.* And whatever you ſay, till you have proved the contrary better than as yet it is done, it will appear, that they are the *Proteſtants who ſtand for the ancient and undefiled*

filed Doctrine of the Catholick Church, againſt the novel and corrupt Tenets of the *Roman Church*. And ſuch kind of *Proteſtation* no true Chriſtian, who meaſures his being *Catholick*, by better grounds than communion with the *Church* of *Rome*, will ever have cauſe to be aſhamed of.

But A. C. (ſaith his Lordſhip) *goes on, and will needs have it, that the Proteſtants were the cauſe of the Schiſm. For,* (ſaith he) *though the Church of* Rome *did thruſt them from her by excommunication, yet they had firſt divided themſelves by obſtinate holding and teaching Opinions contrary to the* Roman *Faith, and practice of the Church, which to do, S.* Bernard *thinks, is pride, S.* Auſtin, *madneſs.* At this his Lordſhip takes many and juſt exceptions. 1. *That holding and teaching was not the prime cauſe neither, but the corruptions and ſuperſtitions of* Rome, *which forced many men to hold and teach the contrary. So the prime cauſe was there ſtill.* Now to this your Anſwer is very conſiderable. *That the Biſhop of* Rome *being S.* Peter's *ſucceſſor in the Government of the Church, and Infallible (at leaſt with a General Council) it is impoſſible, that Proteſtants, or other Sectaries, ſhould ever find ſuch errors or corruptions definitively taught by him, or received by the Church, as ſhould either warrant them to preach againſt her Doctrine, or lawfully to forſake her communion.* We ſay, Your *Church hath erred*; you ſay, It is impoſſible *ſhe ſhould*; we offer you evident proofs of *her errors*; you ſay, *She is Infallible*; we ſay, It is impoſſible, that *Church* ſhould be *Infallible*, which we can make appear hath *been deceived*; you tell us again, It is impoſſible *ſhe ſhould be deceived*; for, let *Hereticks* ſay what they will, *ſhe is Infallible.* And if this be not a ſatisfactory way of anſwering, let the world judge. But having already pulled down that *Babel* of *Infallibility*, this Anſwer falls to the ground with it; and to uſe your phraſe, *The truth is*, all that you have in effect to ſay for your *Church*, is, that ſhe is *Infallible*, and the *Catholick Church*, and by this means you think to caſt the *Schiſm* upon us; and theſe things are great enough indeed, if you could but make any ſhew of proof for them; but not being able to do that, you do in effect as much, as if a man in a *high feaver* ſhould go about to demonſtrate it was *impoſſible* for him to be *ſick*, which, the more he takes pains to do, the more evident his diſtemper is to all who hear him. And it is ſhrewdly to be ſuſpected, if your errors had not been great and palpable, you would have contented your ſelves with ſomething ſhort of Infallibility. But as the caſe is with your *Church*, I muſt confeſs it is your greateſt wiſdom to talk moſt of *Infallibility*; for if you can but meet with any weak enough to ſwallow that, all other things go down without diſpute; but if men are left at liberty to examine particulars, they would as ſoon believe it was impoſſible for that man to *fall*, whom they ſee *upon the ground*, as your *Church* to be *infallible*, which they find overſpread with error and corruptions.

§. 11. P. 136. n. 4.

Ibid.

Much ſuch another Anſwer you return to his Lordſhips ſecond Exception, which is, *at his calling the Chriſtian Faith the* Roman *Faith*: For, you ſay, *It is no incongruity ſo to call it, for the Biſhop of* Rome *being Head of the whole Chriſtian or Catholick Church, the Faith approved and taught by him as Head thereof, though it be* de facto, *the general Faith and Profeſſion of all Chriſtians, may yet very well be called the* Roman *Faith; Why? becauſe the root, origine, and chief Foundation under Chriſt, of its being practiſed and believed by Chriſtians, is at* Rome. But if the *Biſhop* of *Rome* be no ſuch thing as *Head of the Chriſtian Church* (and they muſt have a very *wide Faith*, which muſt *ſwallow* that *Univerſal Headſhip*, with all the *appurtenances*, upon your bare affirmation) if it belongs no more to him to approve and teach the Faith than to any other *Catholick Biſhop*, if the coming from *Rome* affords no credibility at all to the *Chriſtian Faith*; then

Ibid.

ſtill

ſtill there remains as great an incongruity as may be in calling the *Chriſtian Faith*, the *Roman Faith*. And as to all theſe my denial is as good as your affirmation; when you undertake to prove, I ſhall to anſwer.

P. 148. If *A. C.* adds *the practice of the Church to the* Roman *Faith*, I ſee no advantage is gotten by it, for the firſt muſt limit the latter, and the *Faith* being *Roman*, the *Church* muſt be ſo too, and therefore all your cavils on that ſubject come to nothing.

§. 12. P. 137. The third Exception is, *againſt the places out of S.* Bernard, *and S.* Auſtin, which, his Lordſhip ſaith, *are miſ-applied; for neither of them* (ſaith he) *ſpake of the* Roman; *and S.* Bernard *perhaps neither of the Catholick, nor the* Roman, *but of a particular Church or Congregation. His words are, What greater pride, than that one man ſhould prefer his judgement before the whole Congregation? Which* A. C. *conveniently to his purpoſe rendred before the whole Congregation of all the Chriſtian Churches in the world. Whereas no ſuch thing is in him as all the Chriſtian Churches in the world.* And his Lordſhip ſaith, *He thinks it is plain, that he ſpeaks both of, and to the particular Congregation, to which he was then preaching.* This you deny not, but ſay, *The argument holds* à minori ad majus, *to ſhew the more exorbitant pride of thoſe, who prefer their private fanatick Opinions, before the judgement of the whole Catholick Church.* The *Roman Church* you ſhould have ſaid, for you own no *Catholick Church*, but what is *Roman*, and therein the argument you mention will hold yet further, againſt thoſe who prefer the *Novel Opinions* of the *Roman Church*, before the ancient *Apoſtolical Faith* of the *truly Catholick Church*. His Lordſhip adds, *That it is one thing to prefer a mans private judgement before the whole Congregation; and another, for an intelligent man in ſomething unſatisfied, modeſtly to propoſe his doubts even to the Catholick Church. And much more may a whole National Church, nay, the whole body of Proteſtants do it.* Now you very wiſely leave out this laſt clauſe, that you might take an opportunity to declaim againſt *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, *&c.* for want of modeſty. But what pretext could there have been for ſuch virulency, had they been guilty of what you charge them, if you would but have given us all that his Lordſhip ſaid? And may not I now therefore more juſtly return you your own language in the ſame page upon a far leſs occaſion? *That here's a manifeſt robbery of part of his Lordſhips words, for which you are bound to reſtitution. For his Lordſhip, as it were, foreſeeing this cavil, warily adds that concerning a whole National Church, and the whole body of Proteſtants; which you for reaſons beſt known to your ſelf, craftily leave out. But we muſt excuſe our adverſary for this ſlip, though it be an unhandſome one; For the truth is, he had no other way to hide the guiltineſs of his own pen*, &c. Theſe are your own words only applied, and that much more juſtly to your ſelf, for a more palpable fault in the very ſame page wherein you had accuſed his Lordſhip for one of that kind. But you go on further, and *ſuppoſing the doubts had been modeſtly propoſed, yet this could not at all help the Proteſtant cauſe, in regard their doubts were in points of Faith, already determined for ſuch by authority of the Catholick Church; to queſtion any of which with what ſeeming modeſty ſoever is ſinful, heretical, and damnable.* Were it our preſent buſineſs, it were eaſie to make it appear, that the far greateſt part of the matters in Controverſie, were never determined *as points of Faith*, before the *Council of Trent*, and, I hope you will not ſay, that was before the *Reformation*, or any propoſal of doubts? But, if they had been defined by your *Church* for matters of Faith, and our great doubt be, How your *Church* comes to have this power of *determining points* of *Faith*, to whom ſhould this doubt be propounded?

Quæ major ſuperbia quam ut unus homo toti Congregationi judicium ſuum præferat, tanquam ipſe ſolus Spiritum Dei habeat? S. Bern. Serm. 3. de Reſurrect.

Ibid.

to

to your *Church*, no doubt then we should hear from her, as now we do from you, *That to question it with what seeming modesty soever, is sinful, heretical, and damnable.* And, Is it not then likely that your *Church* should ever yield to the proposal of doubts? and you do well to tell us so; for it will save *Protestants* a great deal of labour, when they see your *Church* so incurable, that she makes it *sinful, heretical, and damnable*, to question any thing she hath determined. Although we do with much more reason assert it to be *sinful, heretical and damnable* in your *Church*, to offer to obtrude erroneous Doctrines on the Faith of the *Christian world*, as points necessary to be believed, and to urge superstitious practices as the conditions of communion with her.

To the place of S. *Austin*, wherein he saith, *That it is a part of most insolent madness, for any man to dispute, Whether that be to be done, which is usually done in and through the whole Catholick Church of Christ.* His Lordship answers, 1. *Here's not a word of the* Roman *Church, but of that which is all over the world, Catholick, which* Rome *never yet was*; and for all your boast of having often shewed, *That the Roman and the Catholick are all one*; I dare leave it to the indifferent Reader, Whether you have not miserably failed in your attempts that way. 2. He answers, *That* A. C. *applies this to the* Roman *Faith, whereas S.* Austin *speaks expresly of the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and particularly about the manner of offering upon* Maundy-Thursday, *whether it be in the morning, or after supper, or both.* 3. *'Tis manifest by the words themselves, that S.* Austin *speaks of no matter of Faith there, Roman, nor Catholick, for he speaks of things done, and to be done, and not for things believed, or to be believed.* 4. *A right sober man may, without the least touch of insolency or madness, dispute a business of Religion with the* Roman, *either Church or Prelate, as all men know* Irenæus *did with Victor.* Now to all this you reply, *That the argument still holds* à minori ad majus, *and reaches to every person that in any matter whatsoever obstinately opposes himself against the Church of God.* And is not this an excellent way of arguing from the *less to the greater*, to argue from a *rite* or *ceremony* observed by the Universal *Church* to a *matter of Faith* determined by the *Roman Church?* This is *à minori ad majus* with a witness. But your Reason is as good as your Answer, which is, *because there was always some point or matter of Faith involved in every Universally practised rite or ceremony of the Church*, I pray Sir then, Tell us what the *matter of Faith* was which lay in the offering on *Maunday-Thursday* in morning, or after supper? and by whom this *point of Faith* was determined? and how far it is obligatory? and whether it be not *sinful, heretical, and damnable*, so much as modestly to doubt of it? For all this, you told us, belongs to all matters of Faith determined by the Catholick Church. What remains of this Chapter, need not hold us long, for *A. C.*'s illation from the *Catholick Churches not erring, that therefore it cannot be lawful to separate from the* Roman *Church*, is absurd and illogical; and depends on that gross mistake that the *Roman and Catholick Church* are all one, which we have abundantly disproved in the precedent Chapter. What follows concerning the *Catholick Churches not erring*, and how far *that extends*, concerning the *Catalogue of Fundamentals, and any errors admitted in the Church, being destructive to its Being, because derogatory to Gods Veracity*, have been so amply discussed in their proper places, that I find no temptation from any new arguments here suggested, to resume the debate of them. There being then nothing material, which hath not been handled already; I here conclude this Chapter.

P. 138. P. 149. Ibid. P. 150, 151.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of keeping Faith with Hereticks.

The occaſion of this Diſpute. The reaſon why this Doctrine is not commonly defended: Yet all own ſuch Principles from whence it neceſſarily follows. The matter of fact as to the Council of Conſtance, *and* John Hus *opened. Of the nature of the ſafe-conduct granted him by the Emperor, that it was not a general one,* ſalvâ juſtitiâ, *but particular,* jure ſpeciali; *which is largely proved. The particulars concerning* Hierom *of* Prague. *Of the ſafe-conduct granted by the Council of* Trent. *Of the diſtinction of Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Power, and that from thence it follows, that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.* Simancha, *and ſeveral others fully aſſert this Doctrine. Of the Invitation to the Council of* Trent, *and the good Inſtructions there; and of Publick Diſputation.*

§. 1. A. C.'s Endeavour not only to charge *Proteſtants* with the guilt of *Schiſm,* but to juſtifie and clear the proceedings of the *Church* of *Rome* towards them, hath led us into a new diſpute, how far ſhe is to be truſted in the greateſt promiſes which are made to ſuch whom ſhe accounts *Hereticks.* Which is occaſioned by theſe words of his, *That after this breach was made, the Church of* Rome *was ſo kind and careful to ſeek the Proteſtants, that ſhe invited them publickly with ſafe-conduct to* Rome, *to a General Council, freely to ſpeak what they could for themſelves:* Or, if we take his words, as you give them us, the ſenſe is the ſame to our purpoſe (and therefore you impertinently cavil with his Lordſhip for not keeping Faith with *A. C.*) *Which did at firſt ſeek to recall them from their Novel Opinions, and after their breach did permit, yea invite them publickly to* Rome *to a General Council,* &c. Upon which his Lordſhip ſays: *Indeed I think the Church of*
P. 143. n. 7. Rome *did carefully ſeek the Proteſtants; but I doubt it was to bring them within their net. And ſhe invited them to* Rome. *A very ſafe place, if you mark it, for them to come to, juſt as the Lion (in the Apologue) invited the Fox to his own Den. Yea, but there was ſafe-conduct offered too: Yes, conduct perhaps, but not ſafe, or ſafe perhaps, for going thither, but none for coming thence.* Veſtigia nulla retrorſum. *Yea, but it ſhould have been to a General Council: Perhaps ſo. But was the conduct ſafe, that was given to a Council which they call General, to ſome others before them? No ſure,* John Hus, *and* Jerom *of* Prague *burnt for all their ſafe-conduct. And ſo long as the Jeſuits write and maintain, That Faith given is not to be kept with Hereticks, and the Church of* Rome *leaves this lewd Doctrine uncenſured (as it hath hitherto done, and no exception put in of force and violence)* A. C. *ſhall pardon us, that we come not to* Rome, *nor within the reach of* Roman *Power, what freedom of ſpeech ſoever he promiſed us. For to what end freedom of ſpeech on their part, ſince they are reſolved to alter nothing? And to what end freedom of ſpeech on our part, if*
P. 152 *after ſpeech hath been free, life ſhall not?* This you call a *Theme, which, for the moſt part, our Adverſaries love to dwell upon, as thinking they have ſome great advantage againſt us therein.* And, can you blame them for inſiſting much on that which their lives are concerned in, and it will appear in the proſecution of this ſubject, that we have this great advantage againſt you, that we are come to underſtand your arts ſo well, as not ſo eaſily to be catched by your perfidious ſubtilties. And as we underſtand your *practices* better than to rely on your *promiſes* of this nature, ſo we are not ſo ignorant of the *intrigues* of your proceedings, as to ſuppoſe that commonly and openly

ly you ſhould defend this Poſition, That *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.* For thereby you would loſe the intent and deſign of it; for none would be ſo ſilly as to venture themſelves into the hands of ſuch, who openly profeſs, *They are not bound to keep Faith with them.* For, Do you think that *Father Fulgentio* would ever have gone to *Rome* on the *ſafe-conduct* moſt ſolemnly given by *Paul* 5. if he had underſtood beforehand, with what perfidiouſneſs he ſhould have been dealt with there; and all under this pretext, That *ſafe-conduct was given for his coming thither, but not for his going thence?* Is this the *Faith* of the *Apoſtolical See?* Is this the *Catholick and Roman Faith?* If ſo, the *Roman Faith*, before ever it was *Chriſtian*, was much more *infallible* than this; that never was acquainted with ſuch a perfidious Infallibility. Well then might his Lordſhip ſay, *The conduct might be ſafe for his going thither, but not for his coming thence.* Veſtigia nulla retrorſum. And ſo *Fulgentio* to his ſorrow found it. We ſee therefore, it is very neceſſary for you to diſown this principle as much as poſſible, till you have occaſion to practiſe it, and then woe be to them to whoſe lot it falls to make the experiment. Though therefore both *publickly and privately, in word and writing*, as you tell us, *You teach and profeſs, That Faith is to be kept as well with Hereticks, as Catholicks*, yet your *Adverſaries* have no great reaſon to rely on your promiſes; when they find your practices apparently to the contrary, and thoſe practices built on ſuch principles which you all own, and contend for, and that notwithſtanding what you confidently ſay to the contrary, ſeveral of your Writers have in terms aſſerted it. All which ſhall be made good in this Chapter. And therefore, though you ſay it, and ſay it over again, thoſe who know the ambiguity of your expreſſions, your many reſervations, and exceptions which you make, will not be very confident of the honeſty of your meaning, by the fairneſs of your expreſſions. Theſe are therefore *no clamorous accuſations*, but very ſad truths, which the experience of the world, and your dealings have too often taught us; that at laſt we are forced to diſtinguiſh between a *Princes ſafe-conduct*, and an *Eccleſiaſtical Trepan.* For no other will that appear to be, which was granted by *Pope Paul* to *Fulgentio*, or the *Emperour*, and *Council* of *Conſtance* to *John Huſſe*, and *Hierom* of *Prague.* If *Chriſt* therefore, after he had ſaid, That *they ſhould give to* Cæſar *the things that are* Cæſars, had either denied the payment of *tribute*, or demanded it himſelf, *Becanus* might then ſay, That was a fit parallel for you in this Controverſie, whoſe open actions do palpably contradict you, when you ſay, *That Faith is to be kept with Hereticks.*

§. 2. For the clearing of which, we muſt firſt relate the matter of fact in the caſe of the *Council* of *Conſtance*, and then examine the ſeveral evaſions you make in vindication of their proceedings, notwithſtanding the *ſafe-conduct* given by the *Emperour* and *Council.* The ſtory then is briefly this; A *Council* at *Conſtance* being called for redreſſing abuſes in the *Church*; and putting an end to that *Schiſm*, which was between the three *Antipopes* *Gregory* 12, *Benedict* 13, *John* 23. *John Huſſe* is ſummoned by the *Emperour Sigiſmund* to appear before it. And to take away all fears and ſuſpicions of unhandſome dealing, the *Emperour* grants him a *ſafe-conduct*, in which it was expreſſed, *Omni prorſus impedimento remoto, tranſire, ſtare, morari, & redire libere permittatis*; that without all manner of hindrance, he ſhould be ſuffered to come, appear, ſtay, and return freely. That ſuch a *ſafe-conduct* was given by the *Emperour*, and pleaded by *Huſſe*, is agreed on all ſides. But notwithſtanding this, he had not been above three weeks in *Conſtance*, but, contrary to his *ſafe-conduct*, he is thrown into priſon; which being done in the *Emperours* abſence, he returns to the *Council*, and argues the caſe with them, upon which they paſs the decree

contained in the 19 Seſſion of that *Council*, in theſe words cited in the Margent, which that you may not quarrel with my interpretation of, I will take your own. *This preſent Sacred Synod declareth, That by whatſoever ſafe-conduct, granted by the Emperour, Kings, or other Secular Princes, to Hereticks, or ſuch as are defamed for Hereſie, no prejudice can ariſe, no impediment can, or ought to be put to the Catholick Faith, or other Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, but that (notwithſtanding the ſaid ſafe-conduct) it may be lawful for any competent and Eccleſiaſtical Judge to enquire into the errours of ſuch perſons, and duly otherwiſe proceed againſt them, and puniſh them ſo far as juſtice ſhall require, if they ſhall pertinaciouſly refuſe to revoke their errours; yea though they come to the place of judgement, relying upon ſuch ſafe-conduct, and would not otherwiſe come thither; nor doth he who ſo promiſeth, remain obliged in any thing, having done what lyes in him.* Upon this decree of the *Council* the *Emperour* looks on himſelf, as abſolved from his obligation, and not only concurred in the ſentence againſt *Huſſe*, but gave order himſelf about his execution. The Queſtion then is, Whether the *Emperour* did not break his Faith with *John Huſſe* in ſo doing; and, Whether the *Council* did not decree, that neither he, nor any elſe, were bound to keep it with *Hereticks*. Although this caſe be ſo plain and clear to all perſons, who have any ſenſe of juſtice and honeſty, that we dare appeal to the moſt indifferent perſons in the world, Whether it be not a notorious violation of Faith, after a moſt ſolemn promiſe of ſafe return, to proceed to judgement againſt the perſon, who came meerly relying on that promiſe, and the ſame perſon to be the inſtrument of his execution, who gave the ſafe-conduct on which he truſted: And whether the declaring, that ſuch a perſon is not obliged to keep his promiſe, becauſe it is a matter of *Hereſie* he had promiſed in, be not to declare, *That no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks*. Yet ſince no actions are ſo bad, if they tend to your advantage, but you will have ſomething to blind the eyes of the ſimple with, we muſt conſider what you have to plead in vindication of theſe proceedings. You tell us then, *That the Emperour did not break his Faith with* John Huſſe, *and that notwithſtanding the ſafe-conduct given, he was juſtly burnt*. Bold and daring aſſertions! but we muſt enquire into the reaſons of them. Two things you ſeem moſt to rely on, and the ſtrength of all your Anſwer depends on them: which being the things, *Becanus*, and the reſt of your party inſiſt on in this caſe, I ſhall more cloſely examine. The firſt is, *From the nature of the ſafe-conduct given, that it was not ſuch as could hinder juſtice*; the ſecond is, *From the difference of the Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Power, and that the Emperour could make no promiſe in prejudice of the Churches Juriſdiction.*

Sacra haec Synodus ex quovis ſalvo-conductu ſeu imperatorum, regum, & aliorum ſeculi principum haereticis, vel de haereſi diffamatis, aut ab eorum ſe aliis erroribus revocare, quocunque ſe circa id obligaverint, conceſſo, nullam fidei Catholicae vel juriſdictioni Eccleſiaſticae praejudicium generari, vel impedimentum praeſtari poſſe, ſeu debere declarat, quominus dicto ſalvo-conductu non obſtante, liceat judici competenti & Eccleſiaſtico, de hujusmodi perſonarum erroribus inquirere, & alias contra eos debite procedere, eoſdemque, pariter, quantum juſtitia ſuadebit, ſi ſuos errores revocare pertinaciter recuſaverint, etiamſi ad ſalvo-conductum confiſi ad locum venerint judicii alias non venturi; nec ſic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipſo eſt, ex aliquo remanſiſſe obligatum. Concil. Conſtanc. ſeſſ. 19. p. 1075. Tom. 7. Concil. p. 2. ed. Bini.

P. 153. n. 2.

§. 3. First, You diſtinguiſh of a *ſafe-conduct*, *which*, you ſay, *may be granted two ways*; *firſt*, jure communi, *when 'tis given only againſt unjuſt violence*, Ibid. ſalvâ ſemper juſtitiâ, *provided always that Juſtice be not impeached*: *Secondly*, jure ſpeciali, *when it ſecures a man againſt all violence whatſoever, whether juſt or unjuſt, and chiefly in that cauſe for which it is given. In the former manner only*, you ſay, *A ſafe-conduct was granted by the Emperour to* John Huſſe, *and by the Council of* Conſtance *to* Hierom *of* Prague: *In the latter ſort, the Council of* Trent *offered ſafe-conduct to the Proteſtants in* Germany, &c. *No Faith therefore was broken with* John Huſſe; *for, a ſafe-conduct was only given him* jure communi, *by which Juſtice was to remain unimpeachable, ſince he was only promiſed to be defended againſt unjuſt violence;*

lence; which was performed. I grant, a *ſafe-conduct* may be given two ways; the firſt, is to ſecure men from all unjuſt violence, in order to a legal trial; and this is granted in ſuch caſes, when the perſon accuſed looks on the *Law*, as open for him as well as his *Adverſaries*, and puts himſelf on a fair tryal before equal and indifferent Judges: and in ſuch caſes the intent of the *ſafe-conduct* is expreſſed, *Damus tibi fidem publicam cauſam dicendi in judicio contra vim, non contra juris executionem*; as the *Formula* of it is in the *Roman Empire*; thence that *Imperial Conſtitution*, which prohibits that any *ſafe-conduct* be given to the accuſer, or the guilty perſon *adverſus publicum judicium, ſed ſolum contra vim*, againſt publick juſtice, but only againſt violence: but then, theſe are the *ſafe-conducts* which ſubordinate Officers can only grant; becauſe theſe have no power over the life of perſons, but they are only to ſee juſtice duly adminiſtred to all perſons, in order to which they may give ſuch *ſafe-conducts* as may prevent ſuch things, as may hinder the due execution of Juſtice. But then further, a *ſafe-conduct* may be given with reſpect to thoſe who are to judge of the cauſe, *i. e.* in caſe a perſon avoids appearance upon fears that the perſons he is ſummoned before, will preſently caſt him into priſon, or put him to death; now, if a *ſafe-conduct* be granted by him, who hath the abſolute power of life and liberty, ſo as to hinder the execution of any ſentence paſſed, in this caſe the *ſafe-conduct* is full and abſolute, and admits of no reſtrictions or limitations. Now this latter is plainly our preſent caſe; For *John Huſſe* had been ſummoned before to appear at *Rome*, to vindicate himſelf in point of *Hereſie*, but ſuſpecting foul dealing, he durſt not go: And, Can we in reaſon think he would ever have gone to *Conſtance*, if the *Emperour* had not granted him ſuch a *Conduct* as might ſecure him from his fears, as to his life and liberty? And therefore, ſince the *Emperour*, to whom it only belonged to diſpoſe of both, had granted him ſo expreſs a *ſafe-conduct*, he thought he might ſecurely go. For, To what end or purpoſe is a *ſafe-conduct* granted, if it be not to ſecure that which the perſon to whom it was given, had moſt cauſe to fear? Now it is apparent, *John Huſſe* was not afraid of any unjuſt violence by the way, for he was ſo ſecure as to that, that he left his *ſafe-conduct* in the hands of his friends, till he came at *Conſtance*, as appears by the unqueſtionable reports of that ſtory on all hands; which is an evident argument, that the intent of the *ſafe-conduct* was to ſecure him at *Conſtance*, from any injury being done him by the *Council*. And although the *Council* might take upon them, not only to judge of *Hereſie*, but to condemn him for it; yet, as long as the execution of that ſentence belonged to the Secular Power, he had reaſon to think, that whatever the *Council* might determine, yet the *Emperours Faith* being ſolemnly given him, he need not fear the *execution* of it. For that being in the *Emperours* power, he was bound by his publick Faith not to give way to it. To make this clear by an Inſtance; It is more evident by our Laws, that one who hath taken orders at *Rome*, coming into the Nation, and being convicted of it, is liable to death, than it was by the *Laws* then in force, that ſuch who were condemned for Hereſie, ſhould be burnt; Suppoſe now, that a *Prieſt* be ſummoned by the *King* to appear before his Courts of *Juſtice*, with a *ſafe-conduct*, or promiſe given, that he ſhould come, appear, and return freely, without any hindrance; Would not you, or any other *Romiſh Prieſt*, think your ſelves hardly dealt with, and that the *King* had broken his Faith, if he ſhould not only ſuffer you to be condemned, but give expreſs order for your execution; and then tell you, that the *ſafe-conduct* was to be underſtood *ſalvâ juſtitia*, without any impeachment of *Juſtice*, and that it was only to protect you from all unjuſt violence? And, Was not the caſe juſt the ſame here of the *Emperour Sigiſmund*, and *John Huſſe*? Was

John Huſſe ſo ignorant, as not to know they would condemn him for Hereſie, when a *Council* at *Rome* had condemned him for it already? Or, Did not he know what courſe was like to be taken with perſons ſo condemned? What could he then imagine to be the intent of this *ſafe-conduct*, but to ſecure him from all violence to be done to his perſon under a pretence of execution of Juſtice? And for all this, was not the *Emperours* Faith violated, when he was not only impriſoned, but burnt, by the *Emperours* expreſs order, notwithſtanding his ſolemn promiſe that he ſhould come, appear, and return freely, without any hinderance? If this be a *ſafe-conduct*, it is only ſuch a one as they that go to the *Gallows* have, a *ſafe-conduct* to *execution*. Beſides, that this could not be ſuch a *ſafe-conduct*, *ſalvâ juſtitiâ*, as you ſpeak of, is manifeſt from the tenour and words of it. For *ſafe-conducts*, being granted in favour of perſons, are to be taken in their largeſt ſenſe, if no limitations be expreſſed in them; and it is a *Rule* among thoſe who ſhould, and do underſtand theſe things beſt, *That a ſafe-conduct is of the nature of a Covenant, and the words of it import a promiſe, and therefore if they be general, are extended as far as the words will bear. And that all the Doctors do unanimouſly concur, that a general ſafe-conduct of coming to a Judge, or appearing in a Court of Judicature, do import a freedom of departure and going thence.* So that we ſee, if we take the *Emperours ſafe-conduct* in the expreſs words of it, it imports much more than ſuch a one as is only *ſalvâ juſtitiâ*; becauſe it ran in the moſt general and comprehenſive terms, and was granted not by any ſubordinate *Judge*, but by the Emperour himſelf, who was able, as well as bound, to make it good in the moſt large and extenſive ſenſe. But further, if this had been granted only *ſalvâ juſtitiâ*, ſo that the *Council* had liberty to proceed on him as they ſaw good, What made the *Emperour* take their impriſonment of him ſo ill, as *Nauclerus* and others report he did, and that becauſe of the *ſafe-conduct* he had given him? It ſeems the *Emperour* wanted *Becanus*, and you, to have told him, That he never granted any *ſafe-conduct*, but what had the reſervation of a *ſalvâ juſtitiâ*, and that ſuch juſtice too, as his greateſt enemy muſt ſhew him: If he had known this, he needed not have been troubled at that which he made account of, in granting the *ſafe-conduct*. Laſtly, What need the *Council* have taken ſuch pains to ſatisfie the *Emperour*, by declaring in a decree, that neither he, nor any *Prince* was bound by their *ſafe-conducts*, to hinder Hereticks from being puniſhed, if he had not thought himſelf obliged to do it, by the *ſafe-conduct* he had given? and if he did think ſo before the decree of the *Council*, then certainly there was no *ſalvâ juſtitiâ* underſtood by him in the *ſafe-conduct* he had granted. Thus we ſee, how on all hands it appears, from *Huſſe*'s fears and deſires, the *Emperours* power, the nature of *ſafe-conducts*, the *Emperours* own ſenſe of it, and the *Councils* decree, that this firſt Anſwer hath no ground at all, *viz.* that the *ſafe-conduct* was granted *jure communi*, and that it was only to hinder unjuſt violence, and not the execution of Juſtice.

Verba ſalvi-conductus ſunt verba fidei datæ, & ſapiunt naturam pacti: quare, ſi generalia ſint, extenduntur quatenus verba patiuntur. Omnes Doctores uno ore aſſerunt, Generalem promiſſionem Securitatis veniendi ad judicium ſeu comparendi in judicio, etiam libertatem recedendi abeundiq; completi. Pet. Premus de Securit. quæſt. 6. p. 33, 36.

But beſides, you ſay, *John Huſſe* was juſtly burnt, for two reaſons: *The firſt is, For being obſtinate in his Hereſie; the ſecond, For having fled, which the Emperour had prohibited in his ſafe-conduct, under pain of death.* I anſwer, It is not, Whether a man, obſtinate in *Hereſie*, may be burnt, which is now the Queſtion, although that may juſtly bear a diſpute too: But, Whether one, ſuſpected for *Hereſie*, and coming to a *Council* with *ſafe-conduct* for coming and returning, may be burnt without violation of Faith; your firſt reaſon then, is nothing to the purpoſe, and your ſecond as little: Firſt, Becauſe there is no certain evidence at all of *Huſſe*'s flying; it not being ob-

jected againſt him by the *Emperour*, who only upbraided him with his obſtinacy in his Hereſie, as the cauſe of his execution; and withal, if *Huſſe* had fled and had ſuffered death for that, as you ſay he ought to have done, he would not have ſuffered the death proper to *Hereſie*, and not to flying; nor been accounted (as by all your own Authors he is) a ſufferer on the account of *Hereſie*. But this being a groundleſs *Calumny*, it needs no further confutation.

But before we come to your ſecond Anſwer, the caſe of *Hierom* of *Prague* §. 4.
muſt be diſcuſſed ſo far as it is diſtinct from that of *John Huſſe*; who, it ſeems, was trepanned by a pretended *ſafe-conduct* granted him by the *Council*, and not by the *Emperour*, wherein, you tell us, *that expreſs clauſe of* ſalvâ ſemper juſtitiâ *was inſerted* (which is another argument that the *ſafe-conduct* of the *Emperour* to *Huſſe* was of another nature, becauſe it ran in general terms, without any ſuch clauſe) but poor *Hierom*, who, it ſeems, was not acquainted with the arts and ſubtilties of his enemies, but thought them as honeſt as himſelf, ventures to *Conſtance* upon this *ſafe-conduct*: but when he came thither, and began to underſtand the jugglings of his enemies, he thought to ſhift for himſelf by flight, but being taken, was burnt. So that *Hierom* ſuffered through his honeſt ſimplicity and credulity, not conſidering what that *ſalvâ juſtitiâ* would mean in his caſe, which, as they interpreted it, was ſuch another *ſafe-conduct*, as known *Malefactors* have to the place of *Juſtice*: but to call it a *ſafe-conduct*, in the ſenſe which *Hierom* apprehended it in, is as proper as to ſay, A man that is to be executed ſhall have a *Salvo* for his life. This was therefore intended, as appears by the event, as a meer trick to bring him within their power; and ſo all ſuch *ſafe-conducts* granted with thoſe clauſes (by ſuch perſons who are to interpret them themſelves) are, and nothing elſe: For they are the ſole Judges what this Juſtice ſhall be. Neither can you ſay then, That *Faith* was *kept* with *Hierom* of *Prague*: for no ſuch thing as a *ſafe-conduct*, truly ſo called, was intended him; and when the *Emperour* was ſollicited to grant him one, he utterly denied it, becauſe of the bad ſucceſs he had in that of *John Huſſe*; and ſome of the *Council* being then preſent with the *Emperour*, offered to give him a *ſafe-conduct*, but they very honeſtly explained themſelves, that it was a *ſafe-conduct* for coming thither, but not for going thence again. And ſo it proved. So that Faith was well *given* to *Hierom* of *Prague*, and as well *kept* to *John Huſſe*.

But, ſay you, *Had the Proteſtants gone to the Council of* Trent, *upon the ſafe-conduct granted them by that Council* jure ſpeciali, *in the ſecond manner, they could not at all have been puniſhed under any pretence of Hereſie, without manifeſt breach of Faith; which all Catholicks hold to be unlawful. The like may be ſaid of the ſafe-conduct offered them for going to* Rome. But you muſt better ſatisfie us, that you look upon this as a breach of Faith, than as yet you have done. For ſo many are your ambiguities, in your expreſſions of this nature, that men who know your arts, can hardly tell when they have your right meaning. For you may look on all breach of Faith as unlawful, and yet not look on your acting contrary to your expreſs words, in *ſafe-conducts* offered to *Hereticks*, to be a breach of Faith. For you may ſay, Faith is there only broken, where men are bound to keep it; but you are not bound to keep it with *Hereticks*, and that becauſe your obligation to the *Church* is greater than it can be to *Hereticks*: when therefore you have Hereticks in your power, it is an eaſie matter for you to ſay, that, were it in any thing elſe, but in a matter ſo nearly concerning the *Intereſt* of your *Holy Mother* the *Church*, you could not but obſerve it, but your obligation to that is ſo great, as deſtroys all other which are contrary to it: and the *obligation* being deſtroyed, there is no breach of *Faith*

at

at all; and therefore you may hold all breach of Faith unlawful, and yet you may proceed againſt thoſe whom you account *Hereticks*, contrary to all engagements whatſoever, and then ſay, This is no breach of Faith. And the truth is, by your Doctrines of equivocations, and mental reſervations, you have made all manner of converſe in the world ſo lubricous and uncertain, that he who hath to deal with you, eſpecially in matters where the intereſt of your *Church* is concerned, had need be wary, and *remember to diſtruſt*, or elſe he may repent it afterwards. If you therefore account the *Proteſtants crafty Foxes, in not coming to* Rome, *or the Council of* Trent, it was, becauſe they would not venture too near the *Lions Den*; but if you will not account them *wiſe men*, for refuſing ſo fair an offer, you will give us leave to think them ſo, till they ſee better reaſon to truſt your offers. And the *Council of* Trent did very well to tell them in their form of *ſafe-conduct*, they would not do by them as the *Council* of *Conſtance* did, for therein they ſhew, how much the *Faith* of *Councils* was ſunk by that, ſo that if that were not particularly excepted, no truſt would ever be given to them more. But, ſuppoſing the *ſafe-conduct* of the *Council of* Trent to have been never ſo free from ſuſpicion, the *Proteſtants* had ſufficient reaſons not to appear there, as will be manifeſted afterwards.

§. 5. P. 154. We come therefore now to your ſecond Anſwer, in vindication of the *Council* of *Conſtance*, which is this, *That by that decree the Council declares, that no Secular Power, how ſoveraign ſoever, can hinder the proceedings of the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal in cauſes of Hereſie; for which there is great reaſon; and conſequently, if the Emperour, or any other Secular Prince, grants a ſafe-conduct, or makes promiſe of any thing to the prejudice of that Juriſdiction, it ſhall not hold. The reaſon is, becauſe 'tis a promiſe made of a thing not pertaining to the Juriſdiction of that Prince, nor wholly in his power to ſee performed.* To this I anſwer, 1. That if I underſtand any thing, this is expreſly to ſay, That no *Prince is to keep Faith with Hereticks*, and that is it which you are charged with; and you made uſe of this diſtinction, to free your ſelves from. Now that this is the plain meaning of it, thus appears; you ſay in the words immediately after; *But the Council no where teaches, That Faith or ſafe-conduct given in temporal cauſes properly pertaining to the Princes Juriſdiction, is not to be kept by all, and to all perſons of what condition ſoever, ſo far as it is poſſible.* Which is as much as to ſay, That in any other caſe but that of *Hereſie*, they are to keep Faith, but not in that: for this of *Hereſie*, is that which you oppoſe to all *Temporal Cauſes*, and challenge it as belonging to an *Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal*; when therefore the *Council* of *Conſtance* decrees, That no *Secular Power* is obliged by any *ſafe-conduct*, to any thing which may hinder the *Eccleſiaſtical Tribunals* proceeding in cauſes of *Hereſie*, what doth it elſe but declare in expreſs terms, That *Faith is not to be kept with Heraticks, i. e.* in any thing relating to their *Hereſie*; for this, you ſay, they have nothing to do with: and therefore let *Kings* and *Princes* make never ſo ſolemn promiſes and engagements to men ſuſpected of *Hereſie*, to their peril be it, who rely upon them, for they have nothing to do to promiſe in ſuch matters, and though their Faith be given never ſo publickly and ſolemnly, they are not bound to keep it; nay, they are bound not to keep it: for, if they ſhould, it would be to the apparent miſchief and prejudice of the *Church*. This neceſſarily follows from your own words, and the diſtinction here uſed by you. So that now we need ſeek no further than your ſelf, and *Becanus*, for the open avowing of this Principle, That *no Prince is bound to keep Faith with Hereticks*; but if he doth promiſe *ſafe-conduct* to them though it be more than he can do, yet the *Church* can make that good uſe of it, that by that means ſhe may get the *Hereticks* under her power; and when ſhe hath them, it is but then declaring this promiſe to be null, and ſhe may do with them as ſhe pleaſes.

pleaſes. Neither is it only *Becanus*, and you, who ſay this, but it is the received Principle among you, whatever you ſay or pretend to the contrary; I mean not, that you ſay in expreſs terms, That *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*, but by this diſtinction of the Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Power, as you uſe it, you ſay that from whence it neceſſarily follows. But yet I anſwer 2. Though this diſtinction ſhould be granted, yet it cannot really excuſe the *Emperour* from violating his Faith. For, I ſay, he promiſed nothing but what was in his power, which was, to ſecure him as to life and liberty. Now, although the *Emperour* had ſuffered the *Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal*, to do what belonged to it, which was to enquire into the charge of *Hereſie*, and to give ſentence upon the perſon, yet the execution belonged wholly to the *Secular Power*; as the *Council* it ſelf acknowledged, when after the ſentence of *Hereſie* was pronounced againſt *J. Huſſe*, there was nothing of the executive part which was pleaded, as belonging to the *Church*, but only degradation, and that was performed in the preſence of the Council; upon which the *Sacred Synod declares, That they had no more to do with him, but to deliver him over to the Secular Power, and accordingly decrees it to be done.* Now when the *Synod* declares this, Is it not plain, that what concerns his life, doth properly and only belong to the *Secular Power*? if therefore the *Emperour* was bound to do all which lay in him to do, he was effectually bound to ſecure him as to life and liberty, for both thoſe lay within his power. And therefore, when he gave order for his execution, he was highly guilty of the violation of his Faith; and if the *Council* of *Conſtance* declared him abſolved as to this too, it is yet more evident, that they not only decreed, That *no Faith was to be kept with Hereticks* in matters concerning the *Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal*, but in ſuch as concerned the *Secular Power*, which is as much as to ſay, Not at all. And by this the vanity of this diſtinction of the *Secular* and *Eccleſiaſtical Power* is ſufficiently manifeſt, and that it evidently appears, that the *Council* of *Conſtance* did decree, That *no Faith was to be kept with Hereticks*. And thus I have proved, that his Lordſhip hath not, as you calumniate him, *ignorantly or maliciouſly wronged the Council*, but that no other tolerable ſenſe, beſides that which his Lordſhip ſaith, can be made of the decree then paſſed; and notwithſtanding your arts and diſtinctions, nothing can be more plain, than that *John Huſſe* was trepanned into his ruine by the Faith of the *Emperour* given to him. It can be therefore nothing but either palpable ignorance, or a deceit as groſs as truſting your *ſafe-conduct* in a matter of *Hereſie*, for you ſo confidently to aſſert, *That if the Relator had not mangled the words of the Council (to deceive his Reader) but ſet down the decree fairly and fully as it is, the buſineſs had been ſo clear, that it would ſcarce have any diſpute.* Whereas his Lordſhip only ſets down the title of the decree, and ſo he tells you himſelf, and this he doth as faithfully as may be, and whereas nothing can more evidence the juglings of the *Council*, than the *Decree* it ſelf doth, in which nothing is more plain than that, In caſe of *Hereſie*, no *Prince* is bound to keep Faith with any perſons whatſoever.

Hæc Sancta Synodus Conſtantienſis Johannem Huss, attento quod Eccleſia Dei non habeat ultra quod gerere valeat, judicio ſeculari relinquere, & ipſum curiæ ſeculari relinquendum fore decernit. Concil. Conſtant. ſeſſ. 15. p. 1056.

From the *Council* of *Conſtance*, we proceed to other Authors, to ſee, whether they do not concur with it in this Opinion. For this, his Lordſhip cites *Simancha* a *Spaniſh Biſhop*, and a *Canoniſt* as well as *Civilian*, who expreſly ſaith, *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, as neither with Tyrants, Pirates, or other publick Robbers*; and plainly juſtifies the proceedings of the *Council of Conſtance* in that reſpect, in that *Hereticks by their ſolemn judgement were burnt, although publick ſecurity had been given them.* Let us now ſee, what anſwer §. 6.

Fides Hereticis data ſervanda non eſt, ſicut nec Tyrannis, Piratis, & cæteris publicis prædonibus. Simancha Inſtit. Cathol. tit. 46. ſect. 51.

Jure igitur Hæretici quidam graviſſimo Concilii Conſtantienſis judicio, legitimâ flammâ concremati ſunt, quamvis promiſſa illis ſecuritas fuiſſet. Inſtit. tit. 46. ſect. 52.

you

P. 155. you return to theſe clear Citations. In general you ſay, *The Biſhop was inſincere or unadviſed in quoting this Author.* I wonder wherein: I am ſure, not ſo much as you are in your Anſwers to him. For, you ſay *Simancha holds not this abſolutely and univerſally, but only in caſes, wherein that which is promiſed cannot be lawfully performed. Hence, ſay you,* Simancha *hath theſe words,* Veruntamen (ut Marius Salomonius ait) promiſſa contra Chriſtum fides, ſi præſtetur, perfidia eſt, *If Faith be given againſt Chriſt, that is, to the diſhonour of God, or contrary to the precepts of true Religion, it were perfidiouſneſs to obſerve it.* But the Anſwer to this is eaſie: for it appears from *Simancha's* own grounds, that he ſuppoſeth it holds univerſally, becauſe Faith can never be given to Hereticks, ſo as that promiſe can be lawfully performed, becauſe thereby he ſuppoſeth it given againſt *Chriſt*, and to the diſhonour of *God*, and therefore concludes, it would be perfidiouſneſs to obſerve it. And this is evident from *Simancha's* own grounds, which he gives for it. *For*, ſaith he, *if Faith be not to be kept with Tyrants, Pirates, and other Robbers, which kill the body; much leſs with Hereticks who deſtroy ſouls*: which reaſon being abſolute and Univerſal, his Propoſition muſt be ſo too. And very conſonantly to his former aſſertions concludes, *That if Faith be given them with an Oath, againſt the publick good, againſt the ſalvation of ſouls, againſt divine and humane Laws, it is not to be kept*; and it is well known that all *Hereſies* are accounted ſo by you, and therefore in no caſe *Faith is to be kept with Hereticks.* Neither can this poſſibly be underſtood meerly of private perſons; for his words are general, and we ſee he vindicates the proceedings of the *Council* at *Conſtance* upon theſe grounds, and he quotes *Marius Salomonius* and *Placa*, who likewiſe aſſert in terms, That Faith given to *Hereticks* is not to be kept, and makes uſe of the Inſtance of the *Council* of *Conſtance* to prove it. And *Menochius*, whom *Simancha* likewiſe cites, who was an *Italian Canoniſt*, and therefore might well know the practices of *Rome* in theſe caſes, ſaith, *That* Placa *expreſly holds, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, which, he ſaith, he underſtands ſo, when Faith is given to the injury of the Catholick Faith:* and cites *Conradus Brunus* to this purpoſe, *That it is not lawful to make ſuch agreements with Hereticks, that they may enjoy the liberty of their own ſect.* If therefore they muſt interpret, how far the Faith given tends to the prejudice of the *Catholick Faith*, we ſee, how little ſecurity can be had from any ſolemn promiſe. And *Menochius* himſelf *aſſerts the ſafe-conduct granted by Princes, in caſe of Hereſie, to be unlawful, becauſe the inferiour* (as he ſuppoſes *Princes to be to the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal*) *cannot ſecure them who are condemned by the Superiour, and becauſe Kings and Emperours ought rather to deſtroy Hereticks, than to ſecure them. And therefore the Council of* Conſtance *did well in nulling the ſafe-conducts granted to Hereticks.* And what now is this, but in plain terms to aſſert, That Faith is not to be kept with *Hereticks?* Neither can you ſay, as ſome do, That they are the *Canoniſts*, and not the *Church* of *Rome*, which aſſert this: for, beſides that the *Canoniſts* underſtand well enough the intrigues and proceedings of the *Court* of *Rome*, although it ſeems they do not conceal them ſo much as they ſhould do, yet they are not only theſe who have aſſerted it, but ſome great men of your *Church* have,

Si Tyrannis, Piratis, & cæteris prædonibus fides ſervanda non eſt, qui corpus occidunt; longe minus hæreticis pertinacibus, qui occidiunt animas. Id. ib.

Quamobrem fides illis data, etiam juramento firmata, contra publicum bonum, contra ſalutem animarum, contra jura divina & humana, nullo modo ſervanda. Ib.

Scribit etiam Salomonius in d.l.2. exact. de orig. juris, & refert Petrus Placa l. 1. epit. delict. c. 37. in fin. *Ita obſervatum fuiſſe contra hæreticos vocatos in Concilio Conſtantienſi ſub ſalvo-conductu, qui tamen contra datam fidem necati fuerunt. Non ergo ſalvo-conductui fidere debuit.* D. Scipio. Menochius, lib. 1. Concil. 100. n. 191.

Quod verò ſcribit Placa d. c. 37. in fin. *hæreticis datam fidem ſervandam non eſſe, intelligo cum data fides eſt ad detrimentum fidei Catholicæ.* Id. Concil. 100. n. 219.

Ita enim loquitur Conradus Brunus in tract. de hæret. c. 14. l. 3. *cum ſcribit, Non licere paciſci cum hæreticis, ut liberè poſſint in damnatâ eorum ſectâ vivere.* n. 220.

Quod ſi obiiciatur, Concilium Conſtantienſe non obſervâſſe ſalvos-conductos conceſſos ab Imperatoribus & Regibus; facile erit reſpondere, Non licuiſſe illis Imperatoribus & Regibus, concedere tutos reddere hæreticos; tum quia inferior non poteſt ſalvum-conductum concedere damnato à majori, tum etiam quia Imperatorum & Regum eſt hæreticos expugnare, non autem ſecuros & tutos reddere; quemadmodum abunde tradit Conrad. Brunus, l. 3. de hæret. c. 15. *Rectè à Concilio ſalvi-conductus illi annullati fuerunt.* n. 227, 228.

have, upon occasion, expresly said it; for we are not to expect that this should be avowed as a publick Opinion of your *Church*, for that were to make it unserviceable to you; but when you have those whom you call *Hereticks* at an advantage, then is the time to discover this. So there wanted not some to perswade *Charles the fifth*, notwithstanding the *safe-conduct* given to *Luther* at his coming to *Worms*, to deal by him as the *Council* of *Constance* had done by *John Husse*, and that upon this very account, That no Faith was to be kept with *Hereticks*: But the *Emperour*, and the *Princes* about him, were persons of too great honour and honesty to hearken to such perfidious Counsels. And no meaner a person than *Cardinal Hosius*, admonishes *Henry King of* Poland, *that he ought not to keep the Faith he had given to the Protestants, and gives this reason for it, That an Oath ought not to be the bond of iniquity.* And the Jesuit *Possevin* is reported to have given the same counsel afterwards to *Stephen King of* Poland. But these things are, as much as possible, kept from our view, and the Books containing such Doctrines in them, are like the *Golden Legends* bought up by themselves to prevent our discovery of their frauds and imposture; and therefore if we cannot instance in those *Jesuits*, who have expresly taught this Opinion in print, yet that only argues the greater fraud and subtilty of them, who will own and practise such things, which they dare not publickly avow to the world. And yet it appears from the way used by *Becanus*, and you, in vindication of your selves, that you cannot possibly avoid the asserting such things from whence it necessarily follows, *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.* But because the Doctrine it self is grown a matter so odious to the world, being contrary to all principles of humanity and justice, and which, if practised by all those who call each other *Hereticks*, would overthrow all civil societies; therefore you dare not but in terms disown it, though it still remains among those *Arcana Societatis*, those hidden works of darkness, which want only a fair opportunity to discover themselves. But as much as you wipe your mouth, though it be foul enough in saying, That neither the *Bishop*, nor all his gang, are able to name one of them of that Opinion, to make it appear, how much you have abused your self in these words; I shall make a short business of it, and name your self for *one*, and *Becanus* your Author for *another*, and refer the Reader to what goes before, for an evidence that you own those Principles from whence it unavoidably follows, That no Faith is to be kept with *Hereticks*.

Nunquam patiaris ullâ te ratione ad ea quæ promisisti præstanda teneri; quia juramentum non debet esse vinculum iniquitatis. Hosius Cardinal. Epist. 193, 222, 226.

§. 7. But, Are the Jesuits indeed grown such honest men, that not one of their number can be named, who assert this Doctrine? A happy change! For sure they were not alwaies so; if we believe that excellent person of as great integrity as learning, and a Romanist too, *Jac. Augustus Thuanus* in his *Elegy* in *Parricidas*, wherewith he concludes his sacred Poems; in which he speaks great and sad truths of that honest Society; where he mentions those Cruelties and *Assasinations*, which were brought into these parts of the world by the Arts and Opinions of a famous *Society*, which makes nothing of Laws, Faith, Honesty, Religion, to advance that Interest which it hath espoused; and expresly saith, That they deny Faith to be kept, that by their distinctions and subtilties, they enervate the force of divine commands, they deny obedience to authority, destroy Religion under a pretence of Piety, break engagements, teach the murthering *Kings*; and what not? And yet all this while, not one

Scilicet has artes nuper gens gnara nocendi
Exitio invexit, Gallia, nata tuo.
Hesperiæ fuscis gens emissaria ab oris
Fucum affectatâ quæ gravitate tegit,
Nata Magistratum convellere, nata Ministris
Subtrahere obsequium, Præsulibusq; suum:
Geryonæ quæ dum placeat, faveatq; trifauci,
Terrarum reliquos non facit ussis heros.
Et cælo facinus dignum putat, omnia sævi
In Regis longas tradere sceptra manus.
Quæ disciplinam morum, quæ Gallica venit,
Exuvo, legum solvere jura, metu,
Et vilem regnantem animas, ipsoq; necandos
Horrendâ Reges proditione docet;
Servandamq; fide negat, argutisq; cavillis
Detorquet magni jussa severa Dei.
Nos patimur segnes, lentiq; sedemus ad iram.
Et pietas ipsâ religione perit.
Protinus Induciæ violantur patre Quiritum
Auctore, & Martis nuncius urbe venit.
Nos juvat antiquo vitam producere ritu,
Nos juvat in priscâ simplicitate mori.
Jac. Aug. Thuan. Eleg. in Parricidas.

of all this Society ever taught, That Faith was not to be kept with Hereticks. But whence came then the great disputes, Whether an Oath of Allegiance might be taken to *Heretical* Princes? Was it not from hence that *Heresie* was supposed to dissolve that obligation to obedience, which otherwise men lay under? And if it doth destroy that Faith which men owe to their Soveraigns, in case of *Heresie*; Will it not equally destroy that Faith which *Princes* promise to their subjects in case of *Heresie* too? For what reason can be given for the one, which will not hold for the other also. And who were they, I pray, but those loyal persons the *Jesuits*, who broached, fomented, and propagated that Doctrine? Was not *Father Cresswell* a *Jesuit*, who under the name of *Andreas Philopator*, delivers this excellent Doctrine, *That the whole School of Divines teach, and it is a thing certain, and of Faith, that any Christian Prince, if he manifestly falls off from the Religion of the Catholick* Roman *Church, and endeavours to draw others from it, doth by Law of God and man, fall from all power and authority; and that before the Sentence of the Pope and Judge delivered against him; and that all his subjects are free from the obligation of any Oath to him, of obedience and loyalty, and that they may and ought to cast such a one out of his power, as an Apostate and a Heretick, lest he infect others.* I might mention many more, who write after the same nature, but I spare you, only this one may serve instead of many; for he delivers it not only as his own judgement, but the consent of the School, and as a thing most certain, as being of Faith: And will you still say, That no *Jesuits* own such principles, as, *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks?* For if *Heresie* doth thus destroy all obligation to obedience in subjects to *Heretical Princes*, Will it not much more in *Princes* toward heretical subjects? because certainly *Princes* have a greater power and right to command over subjects, than *subjects* over them, even in your own case of *Heresie*. Since this therefore is the avowed Doctrine of the *Jesuitical School*, perswade whom you can to believe, that you look on an obligation to Faith remaining in a case of *Heresie?* Certainly none who understand your principles and practices, will have much cause to rely on your Faith in this particular. So much at present of the *Jesuits* Integrity,

P. 156. as to this principle of *keeping Faith with Hereticks*. What you add further about the *Council* of *Constance*, and *John Husse*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*, is only serving up the very same matter in somewhat different words; for there is nothing contained in them but what hath been sufficiently disproved already: for it all depends on the nature of the *safe-conduct*, and the difference of the *Secular* and *Ecclesiastical Power*.

§. 8. His Lordship very pertinently asks, *supposing men might go safely to* Rome, *To what purpose is it to go to a General Council thither, and use freedom of speech, since the Church of* Rome *is resolved to alter nothing*; and you very pertinently answer, *That they were invited thither to be better instructed, and*

P. 157. *reclaimed from their errours*. But, Will no place serve to reclaim them but *Rome?* Can they not be as well instructed elsewhere, and by other means, than by being summoned to a *General Council?* We had thought the intention of *General Councils* had been to have had free debates concerning the matters which divide the *Church*. But, it seems the *Protestants* must have been summoned as guilty persons, *i. e. Hereticks*, and their *Adversaries* must have sate as their proper *Judges*, and such who were accused as the great *Innovators*, must have believed themselves *Infallible*, and by your own saying, *If an Angel from Heaven had come as a Protestant thither*, he would not have been believed; nay, it had been well he had escaped so, if your power were

universa Theologorum Schola tenet, & est certum ac de fide, Quemcunque principem Christianum, si à Catholicâ Romana Religione manifestè deflexerit, & alios avocare voluerit, excidere statim omni potestate, & dignitate ex ipsâ vi juris divini & humani: hocque & ante sententiam Pontificis & Judicis contra ipsum prolatam; & subditos quoscunque liberos esse ab ôni juramenti obligatione, quod de obedientiâ præstitissent, possseque & debere hujusmodi hominem tanquam Apostatam & hæreticum ex dominatu ejicere, nè alios inficiat. Andreas Philopator Resp. ad edict. Regin. Angl. p. 149. n. 157.

were as great over *ſpirits*, as over our groſſer bodies. So I ſuppoſe *John Huſſe*, and *Hierom* of *Prague* were invited to *Conſtance* to *be better inſtructed*; and it is well we know by their example what you mean by *your good inſtructions*, and out of a deſire to avoid them, care not how little we appear where our *Adverſaries* not only intend to be *Judges*, but reſolve beforehand to condemn us whatſoever we ſay: For ſo you tell us, *That* Rome, *and the Fathers of* Trent *were reſolved to ſtick to their own Doctrine* (which they call *Catholick*) *notwithſtanding any pretended difficulties or objections brought againſt it, either by Biſhops, or any other perſon.* Your kind invitations then of the *Proteſtants*, were wonderful expreſſions of your *Churches* civility towards them; that they might be preſent to hear themſelves condemned, and then eſcape how they could themſelves.

The offer of a *publick Diſputation*, his Lordſhip truly tells you, *ſignifies nothing without an indifferent arbitration, and the impoſſibility of agreeing on that, renders the other uſeleſs*; and only becomes ſuch Thraſonical perſons as *Campian* was, who yet had as little reaſon as any man to boaſt of his Atchievements in his diſputations. When you therefore ſay, *His Lordſhip would have ſome Atheiſt, Turk or Jew, to ſit as indifferent perſons*; you ſhew only your Scurrility, and want of underſtanding. For his Lordſhip only inſiſts on the neceſſity of that, to ſhew the uſeleſneſs of publick Diſputations, where ſuch cannot be agreed on, as in this caſe. And he truly ſaith, *This is a good Anſwer to all ſuch offers; that the Kings and Church of* England *had no reaſon to admit of a publick Diſpute with the Engliſh Romiſh Clergy, till they ſhall be able to ſhew it under the Seal or Powers of* Rome, *that that Church will ſubmit to a Third, who may be an indifferent Judge between us and them; or to ſuch a General Council as is after mentioned* (not ſuch a one as you would have, wherein the *Pope ſhould ſit as Head of the Church*, for that is to make the greateſt Criminal, Judge in his own cauſe.) *And this*, ſaith he, *is an honeſt, and, I think, a full Anſwer. And without this, all Diſputation muſt end in Clamour; and therefore the more publick, the worſe. Becauſe, as the Clamour is the greater, ſo perhaps will be the Schiſm too.* P. 185.

CHAP. IV.

The Reformation of the Church of *England* juſtified.

The Church of Rome *guilty of Schiſm, by unjuſtly caſting Proteſtants out of Communion. The Communion of the Catholick and particular Churches diſtinguiſhed. No ſeparation of Proteſtants from the Catholick Church. The Devotions of the Church of* England *and* Rome *compared. Particular Churches Power to reform themſelves in caſe of general Corruption, proved. The Inſtance from the Church of* Judah *vindicated. The Church of* Rome *paralleld with the ten Tribes. General Corruptions make Reformation the more neceſſary. Whether thoſe things we condemn as errours, were Catholick Tenets at the time of the Reformation. The contrary ſhewed, and the difference of the Church of* Rome *before and ſince the Reformation. When things may be ſaid to be received as Catholick Doctrines. How far particular Churches Power to reform themſelves extends. His Lordſhips Inſtances for the Power of Provincial Councils in matters of Reformation vindicated. The particular caſe of the Church of* England *diſcuſſed. The proceedings in our Reformation defended. The Church of* England *a true Church. The National Synod* 1562. *a lawful Synod. The Biſhops no intruders in Queen* Elizabeth's *time. The juſtice and moderation of the Church of* England *in her Reformation. The Popes Power here, a forcible fraudulent uſurpation.*

§. 1. HAving thus far examined your Doctrine, of keeping Faith with *Hereticks*, we now return to the main buſineſs concerning *Schiſm*. And
P. 146. §. 22. his Lordſhip ſaying, *That there is difference between departure out of the Church, and cauſeleſs thruſting from you; and therefore denying that it is in your power to thruſt us out of the Church*; You anſwer by a Conceſſion, *That we were thruſt out from the Church of* Rome, *but that it was not without cauſe:*
P. 185. n. 1. Which, that you might not ſeem to ſay *gratis*, you pretend to aſſign the cauſes of our expulſion. So that by your own confeſſion the preſent diviſion or ſeparation lyes at the *Church* of *Rome*'s door, if it be not made evident that there were moſt juſt and ſufficient reaſons for her caſting the *Proteſtants* out of her communion. If therefore the *Church* of *Rome* did thruſt the *Proteſtants* from her communion, for doing nothing but what became them as members of the *Catholick Church*, then that muſt be the *Schiſmatical* party, and not the *Proteſtants*. For, ſuppoſing any *Church* (though pretending to be never ſo *Catholick*) doth reſtrain her communion within ſuch narrow and unjuſt bounds, that ſhe declares ſuch excommunicate, who do not approve all ſuch errours in doctrine, and corruptions in practice, which the Communion of ſuch a *Church* may be liable to, the cauſe of that diviſion which follows, falls upon that *Church* which exacts thoſe conditions from the members of her Communion: That is, when the errours and corruptions are ſuch as are dangerous to ſalvation. For in this caſe, that *Church* hath firſt divided her ſelf from the *Catholick Church*; for, the Communion of that lying open and free to all, upon the neceſſary conditions of Chriſtian Communion, whatever *Church* takes upon her to limit and incloſe the bounds of the *Catholick*, becomes thereby divided from the Communion of the *Catholick Church*: and all ſuch who diſown ſuch an unjuſt *incloſure*, do not ſo much divide from the Communion of that *Church* ſo incloſing, as return to the Communion of the *Primitive* and *Univerſal Church*. The *Catholick Church* therefore lyes open and free, like a *Common-Field* to all Inhabitants; now if any particular number of theſe Inhabitants ſhould agree together, to encloſe part of it, without

without conſent of the reſt, and not to admit any others to their right of *Common*, without conſenting to it, which of theſe two parties, thoſe who deny to yield their conſent; or ſuch who deny their rights if they will not, are guilty of the violation of the publick and common rights of the place? Now this is plainly the caſe between the *Church* of *Rome*, and Ours? the Communion of the *Catholick Church* lyes open to all ſuch who own the *Fundamentals* of *Chriſtian Faith*, and are willing to joyn in the profeſſion of them: Now to theſe your *Church* adds many particular Doctrines, which have no foundation in *Scripture*, or the conſent of the Primitive *Church*; theſe, and many ſuperſtitious practices, are enjoyned by her, as conditions of her Communion, ſo that all thoſe are debarred any right of Communion with her, who will not approve of them; by which it appears, your *Church* is guilty of the firſt violation of the *Union* of the *Catholick*; and whatever number of men are deprived of your Communion, for not conſenting to your uſurpations, do not divide themſelves from you, any further than you have firſt ſeparated your ſelves from the *Catholick Church*. And when your *Church* by this act is already ſeparated from the Communion of the *Catholick Church*, the diſowning of thoſe things wherein your *Church* is become *Schiſmatical*, cannot certainly be any culpable ſeparation. For, whatever is ſo, muſt be from a *Church* ſo far as it is *Catholick*; but in our caſe it is from a *Church* ſo far only as it is not *Catholick*, *i. e.* ſo far as it hath divided her ſelf from the Belief and Communion of the *Univerſal Church*.

But herein a great miſtake is committed by you, when you meaſure the Communion of the *Catholick Church*, by the judgement of all, or moſt of the particular *Churches* of ſuch an *Age*, which ſuppoſes that the Church of ſome *one particular Age*, muſt of neceſſity be preſerved from all errours and corruptions, which there is no reaſon or neceſſity at all to aſſert; and that is all the ground you have for ſaying, *That the ſeparation of Proteſtants was not only from the Church of* Rome, *but* (*as* Calvin *confeſſeth*) *à toto mundo, from the whole Chriſtian world, and ſuch a ſeparation neceſſarily involves ſeparation from the true Catholick Church.* Now to this, we anſwer two things. 1. That we have not ſeparated from the whole *Chriſtian World* in any thing wherein the whole *Chriſtian World* is agreed; but to diſagree from the particular *Churches* of the *Chriſtian World* in ſuch things wherein thoſe *Churches* differ among themſelves, is not to ſeparate from the *Chriſtian World*, but to diſagree in ſome things from ſuch particular *Churches*. As I hope you will not ſay, That man is divided from all mankind, who doth in ſome feature or other differ from any one particular man; but, although he doth ſo, he doth not differ from any in thoſe things, which are common to all; for that were to differ from all; but when he only differs from one in the colour of his eyes, from another in his complexion, another in the air of his countenance, and ſo in other things; this man, though he ſhould differ from every particular man in the world in ſomething or other, yet is a man ſtill as well as any, becauſe he agrees with them in that in which they all agree, which is, Humane nature, and differs only in thoſe things wherein they differ from each other. And therefore from the diſagreement of the *Proteſtants* from any one particular *Church*, it by no means follows, that they ſeparated from the whole Chriſtian World, and therefore from the true *Catholick Church*. 2. The Communion of the *Catholick Church* is not to be meaſured by the particular opinions and practices of all, or any particular *Churches*, but by ſuch things which are the proper *Foundations* of the *Catholick Church*. For there can be no ſeparation from the true *Catholick Church*, but in ſuch things wherin it is *Catholick*; now it is not *Catholick* in any thing, but what properly relates to its Being and Conſtitution. For whatever elſe there is, however univerſal it may be, is extrinſecal to the nature and no-

§. 2.

P. 159.

tion

tion of the *Catholick Church*, and therefore ſuppoſing a ſeparation from the *Church*, in what is ſo extrinſecal and accidental, it is no proper ſeparation from the *Catholick Church*. As for inſtance; ſuppoſing all men were agreed, that ſome particular *habit* ſhould be worn all over the world, will you ſay, That any number of men who found this habit extremely inconvenient for them, and therefore ſhould diſuſe it, did on that account ſeparate from humane nature, and ceaſed to be men by it? Such is the caſe of any particular *Churches* laying aſide ſome cuſtomes or ceremonies, which in ſome one age of the *Church*, or more, the greateſt part of *Chriſtian Churches* were agreed in the practice of; for, although this general practice ſhould make men more diligent in enquiry, and careful in what they did; yet if ſuch a *Church* having power to govern it ſelf, ſee reaſon to alter it, it doth not ſeparate from the Communion of the *Catholick Church* therein, and therefore doth not ceaſe to be a *Church*. For there is no culpable ſeparation from the *Church Catholick*, but what relates to it properly as *Catholick*; now that doth not relate to it as *Catholick*, which it may be *Catholick* without. Now certainly you cannot have ſo little reaſon as to aſſert, that the *Church* cannot be *Catholick* without ſuch extrinſecal and accidental agreements. And from hence it follows, That no *Church* can be charged with a ſeparation from the true *Catholick Church*, but what may be proved to ſeparate it ſelf in ſome thing neceſſary to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*; and ſo long as it doth not ſeparate as to theſe eſſentials, it cannot ceaſe to be a true member of the *Catholick Church*. If you would therefore prove, that the *Church* of *England*, upon the Reformation, is ſeparated from the true *Catholick Church*; you muſt not think it enough to ſay, (which as weakly as commonly is ſaid) *That no one particular Church can be named, which in all things agreed with it*; for that only proves, that ſhe differed from particular *Churches* in ſuch things wherein they differed from each other, but that ſhe is divided from all Chriſtian *Churches* in ſuch things wherein they are all agreed, and which are eſſential to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*; when you have proved this, you may expect a further Anſwer.

§. 3. This then can be no cauſe why your *Church* ſhould expel the *Proteſtants* out of her Communion, but it ſhews us ſufficient cauſe to believe that your *Church* had ſeparated her ſelf from the Communion of the *Catholick*. For which we muſt further conſider, that although nothing ſeparates a *Church* properly from the *Catholick*, but what is contrary to the *Being* of it; yet a *Church* may ſeparate her ſelf from the *Communion* of the *Catholick*, by taking upon her to make ſuch things the neceſſary conditions of her Communion, which never were the conditions of Communion with the *Catholick Church*. As for Inſtance, Though we ſhould grant, *Adoration of the Euchariſt*, *Invocation of Saints*, and *Veneration of Images* to be only ſuperſtitious practices taken up without ſufficient grounds in the *Church*, yet ſince it appears, that the Communion of the *Catholick Church* was free for many hundred years, without approving or uſing theſe things; that *Church* which ſhall not only publickly *uſe*, but *enjoyn* ſuch things upon pain of excommunication from the *Church*, doth, as much as in her lyes, draw the bounds of *Catholick Communion* within her ſelf, and ſo divides her ſelf from the *true Catholick Church*. For, whatever *confines*, muſt likewiſe *divide* the *Church*; for by that confinement a ſeparation is made between the part confined, and the other, which ſeparation muſt be made by the party ſo limiting *Chriſtian* Communion. As it was in the caſe of the *Donatiſts*, who were therefore juſtly charged with *Schiſm*, becauſe they confined the *Catholick Church* within their own bounds: And if any other *Church* doth the ſame which they did, it muſt be liable to the ſame charge which they were. The ſumm then of this diſcourſe is, That the *Being* of

the

the *Catholick Church* lyes in *Eſſentials*, that for a particular *Church* to diſagree from all other particular *Churches* in ſome extrinſecal and accidental things, is not to ſeparate from the *Catholick Church*, ſo as to ceaſe to be a *Church*; but ſtill, whatever *Church* makes ſuch extrinſecal things the neceſſary conditions of Communion, ſo as to caſt men out of the *Church*, who yield not to them, is *Schiſmatical* in ſo doing; for it thereby divides it ſelf from the *Catholick Church*: and the ſeparation from it, is ſo far from being *Schiſm*, that being caſt out of that *Church* on thoſe terms only, returns them to the Communion of the *Catholick Church*. On which grounds it will appear, that yours is the *Schiſmatical Church*, and not ours. For, although before this impoſing humour came into particular *Churches*, *Schiſm* was defined by the *Fathers*, and others, to be *a voluntary departure out of the Church*, yet that cannot in reaſon be underſtood of any particular, but the *true Catholick Church*; for not only perſons, but *Churches* may depart from the *Catholick Church*; and in ſuch caſes, not thoſe who depart from the Communion of ſuch *Churches*, but thoſe *Churches* which departed from the *Catholick*, are guilty of the *Schiſm*.

Theſe things I thought neceſſary to be further explained, not only to ſhew, how falſe that imputation is, of our *Churches* departing from the true *Catholick Church*, but with what great reaſon we charge your *Church* with departing from the Communion of it; and therefore not thoſe whom you thruſt out of Communion, but your *Church* ſo thruſting them out, is apparently guilty of the preſent *Schiſm*.

But ſtill you ſay, *Your Church had ſufficient cauſe for the expulſion of Proteſtants out of her Communion*; and for this you barely repeat your former aſſertions, and offer not at the proof of one of them; as though you intended to carry your cauſe, by the frequent *repeating* your *Declaration*. But, Sir, it is the proof of what you ſay, that we expect from you, and not the bare telling us, *That Proteſtants are Schiſmaticks*, becauſe they are *Schiſmaticks*. When you will be at leiſure to prove that the *Proteſtants* were guilty of *Heretical Doctrine, or Schiſmatical proceedings*; that they raiſed *a new, ſeparate, and mutinous faction of pretended Chriſtians diſtinct from the one Catholick body of the Church*; *by chuſing new Paſtors, inſtituting new rites and ceremonies not in their power to do, by Schiſmatical convening in ſeveral Synods, and there broaching new heretical Confeſſions of Faith*; when I ſay, You ſhall think good to prove all, or any one of theſe, you ſhall receive ſo full an Anſwer as will make it evident, that the *Proteſtants* did not depart from the *Catholick Churches* Doctrine and Communion; but that the *Church* of *Rome* is departed thence, firſt, by impoſing erroneous Doctrines, and ſuperſtitious practices, as conditions of Communion, and then by thruſting out all ſuch as would not conſent to them. P. 158. n. i.

His Lordſhip diſputing the terms on which a *Separation* in the *Church* may be lawful, ſaith, *That corruption in manners only, is no ſufficient cauſe to make a ſeparation in the Church. And*, ſaith he, *This is as ingenuouſly confeſſed for you, as by me. For if corruption in manners were a juſt cauſe of actual ſeparation of one Church from another, in that Catholick body of Chriſt, the Church of* Rome *hath given as great cauſe as any, ſince* (*as* Stapleton *grants*) *there is ſcarce any ſin that can be thought on by man* (*Hereſie only excepted*) *with which that See hath not been fouly ſtained, eſpecially from eight hundred years after Chriſt. And he need not except Hereſie, into which* Biel *grants it poſſible, the Biſhops of the See may fall. And* Stella *and* Almain *grant it freely, that ſome of them did fall, and ſo ceaſed to be Heads of the Church, and left Chriſt* (*God be thanked*) *at that time of his Vicars defection, to look to his Cure himſelf.* But you tell us, *The diſcovery of ſome few motes, darkens not the brightneſs of the Sunſhine*; I wonder what you account §. 4. P. 146. n. 22. P. 159.

account *Beams*, if the *Sins* of your *Popes* and others be but *motes* with you? We grant, that the *Sun* himſelf hath his *Maculæ*, but they are ſuch as do not *Eclipſe* his *Light*; we find the *Maculæ* in your *Church*, but we are to ſeek for the bright *Sunſhine*. Or, Doth it lye *in the ſervice of your Religious Votaries?* For that is the great part of the conſpicuous Piety of your *Church*, which you inſtance in. But, Is this indeed the *bright Sunſhine of your Church*, that there are *ſo many thouſand of both Sexes* (you do well to joyn them together) *who tye themſelves by perpetual vows, never to be diſſolved by their own ſeeking* (and therefore doubtleſs pleaſing to *God*, whether they are able to keep them or no) *and theſe pray* (if they underſtand what they ſay) *and ſing Divine Hymns day and night* (which makes the Sunſhine the brighter) *which you ſay is a ſtrange and unheard of thing among Proteſtants.* What, that men and women (though not in Cloyſters) *pray and ſing Hymns to God?* no ſurely. For as the Devotion of our *Churches* is more grave and ſolemn, ſo it is likewiſe more pious and intelligible. *You pray and ſing*, but how? Let *Eraſmus* ſpeak, who underſtood your praying and ſinging well. *Cantiunculârum, clamorum, murmurum ac bombórum ubique plus ſatis eſt, ſi quid iſta delectant Superos.* Do you think thoſe Prayers and Hymns are pleaſing to *God*, which lye more in the throat than the heart? And ſuch who have been wiſe and devout men among your ſelves have been the leaſt admirers of your mimical, uncouth, and ſuperſtitious devotions; but have rather condemned them as vain, ludicrous things; and wondered (as *Eraſmus* ſaid) what they thought of Chriſt, who imagined he could be pleaſed with them. (*Quid ſentiunt obſecro de Chriſto qui putant eum ejuſmodi cantiunculis delectari?*) Are theſe then the glorious parts of your Devotions, *your Prayers and Hymns?* But *they pray and ſing Divine Hymns day and night:* If this be the only excellency of your Devotion, How much are you out-done by the ancient *Pſalliani* and *Euchitæ*, that ſpent all their time in prayer, and yet were accounted *Hereticks* for their pains? Still *you pray and ſing*, but to whom? to *Saints and Angels* often, to the *Virgin Mary* with great Devotion, and moſt ſolemn invocations; but to *God* himſelf, very ſparingly in compariſon. If this then be the *warm Sunſhine* of your Devotions, we had rather uſe ſuch, wherein we may be ſure of *Gods bleſſing*; which we cannot be in ſuch Prayers and Hymns which attribute thoſe honours to his creatures, which belong wholly to himſelf. But you *not only ſing and pray*, but can be very *idle* too; and the number of thoſe men muſt be called *Religious Orders*, and *the Garment of the Church is ſaid by you to be imbroidered by the variety of them*; and for this, *Pſalm* 44. 10. is very luckily quoted. And are thoſe indeed the ornaments of your *Church*, which were become ſuch ſinks of wickedneſs, that thoſe of your *Church*, who had any modeſty left were aſhamed of them, and call'd loud for a *Reformation?* Thoſe were indeed ſuch *Gardens* wherein it were more worth looking for *uſeful or odoriferous flowers* (as you expreſs it) than for *Diogenes* to find out an honeſt man in his croud of Citizens. Therefore not to diſpute with you the firſt Inſtitutions of *Monaſtick life*, nor how commendable the nature of it is, nor the conveniencies of it, where there are no indiſpenſable vows; the main things we blame in them, are, the reſtraints of mens liberties, whatever circumſtances they are in, the great degeneracy of them in all reſpects from their Primitive *Inſtitutions*, the great ſnares which the conſciences of ſuch as are engaged in them, are almoſt continually expoſed to, the unuſefulneſs of them in their multitudes to the *Chriſtian* world, the general

Eraſm. in Mat. 6. 7.

Hodie videmus Sacerdotes, nihil dicam quibus ſed certè nimium prolixis precibus, hiſq; præſcriptis, aliquoties ineptis ac ridiculis, nè dicam impiis, onerátos. Eraſm. in Mat. 6. 7. *Ad hæc qui modeſtè pii ſunt, taciti ſecum ingemiſcunt: qui populi malis aluntur. & quorum intereſt Chriſti gregem, quem ille ſuo ſanguine liberum reddidit, quàm maximè ſervum eſſe & obnoxium, adeò non reclamant ut modis omnibus exaggerent. Accedunt iis qui vel ambiunt præmium aliquod obſequii vel timent pœnam libertatis. Ita dum nemo ſuccurrit, res paulatim eò prolabitur ut penè nihil jam pudeat.* Id. in Mat. 11. 30.

general unſerviceableneſs of the perſons who live in them, the great debaucheries which they are ſubject to, and often over-run with; and if theſe then be the greateſt *Ornaments* of your *Churches Garments*, it is an eaſie matter to eſpy the *ſpots* which ſhe hath upon her. What you add *concerning the good lives of Papiſts and bad of Proteſtants*, if taken univerſally, is as unjuſt as uncharitable; if indefinitely, it ſhews only that not the particular lives of men on either ſide, but the tendency of the *Doctrine*, to promote or hinder the ſanctity of them, is here to be regarded. And to that you ſpeak afterwards, but in a moſt falſe and virulent manner, when you ſay, *That though ſins be committed among you, they are not defended or juſtified as good works; whereas, among Proteſtants, Darkneſs it ſelf is called Light, and the greateſt of all ſins,* viz. *Hereſie, Schiſm, Sacriledge, Rebellion,* &c. *together with all the bad ſpawn they leave behind them, are cryed up for perfect Virtue, Zeal, good Reformation, and what not?* I doubt not but you would be ready to defend and juſtifie this open *Raillery* of yours, and call it a *good work*, notwithſtanding what you ſaid before. If we had a mind to follow you in ſuch things, How eaſie a matter were it to rip up all the *frauds, impoſtures, villanies* of all ſorts and kinds which have been committed by thoſe who have ſate in your *Infallible Chair*, and charge them all on your *Church*, with much more juſtice than you do the miſcarriages of any under the name of *Proteſtants?* For the *Proteſtant Churches* diſown ſuch perſons, and condemn thoſe practices with the greateſt indignation; whereas you excuſe, palliate, and plead for the lives of the *Popes*, as much as you dare, and not out-face the *Sun* at *Noon*, which hath laid open their *Villanies*. Where do the Principles of *Proteſtants* incourage or plead for *Hereſie, Schiſm, Sacriledge, Rebellion*, &c. much leſs cry them up as *Heroical actions?* Doth not the *Church* of *England* diſown and diſclaim ſuch things to the uttermoſt? Have not her *ſufferings* made it appear, how great a hater ſhe is of *Hereſies, Schiſms, Sacriledge*, and *Rebellion?* Did ſhe ever cry up thoſe for *Martyrs*, who died in *Gun-powder treaſons?* Did ſhe ever teach it lawful to diſobey Heretical *Princes*, and to take away their lives? Yet theſe things have been done by you, and the doers of them not condemned, but rather fomented and incouraged, as zealous promoters of the *Holy See*, and moſt devout Sons of the *Church* of *Rome*. Ceaſe therefore to charge the guilt of perſons diſowned by the *Church* of *England* upon her; when you are unwilling to hear of the faults of thoſe perſons among your ſelves, whom you dare not diſown, I mean your *Popes* and *Jeſuits*.

P. 160.

§. 5.

Leaving therefore theſe unbecoming *Railleries* of yours, and that which occaſioneth them, *viz. corruption of manners*; we come to conſider that, which is more pertinent to our purpoſe, *viz. errors in Doctrine*; which his Lordſhip truly aſſigned as the ground of the *Reformation, and not only that there were doctrinal errors in your Church, but that ſome of the errors of the* Roman *Church were dangerous to ſalvation. For it is not every light error in diſputable Doctrine and points of curious ſpeculation, that can be a juſt cauſe of ſeparation, in that admirable body of Chriſt, which is his Church, or of one member of it from another. But, that there are errors in Doctrine, and ſome of them ſuch as moſt manifeſtly endanger ſalvation in the Church of* Rome, *is evident to them that will not ſhut their eyes. The proof* (his Lordſhip ſaith) *runs through the particular points, and ſo is too long for this diſcourſe.* Now to this you manfully anſwer, *That in vain do they attempt to reform the Church of what ſhe can never be guilty.* Which, if it depends on your *Churches Infallibility* (which is largely diſproved already) muſt needs fall to the ground with it. And it is an excellent Anſwer when a *Church* is charged actually with erring, to ſay, *She doth not err*, becauſe *ſhe cannot:* Which is all that you give us here. But if you prove it no

P. 147. n. 2.

P. 160.

better than you have done, the *Heretical* and *Schiſmatical obſtinacy* is like to be found in that *Church* which in her errors challenges *Infallibility*.

The Queſtion now comes to this, *Whether, errors being ſuppoſed in the Doctrine, and corruptions in the Communion of a Church, when the General Church would not reform, it was not lawful for particular Churches to reform themſelves?* To this his Lordſhip anſwers affirmatively, in theſe words. P. 149. ſect. 24. *Is it then ſuch a ſtrange thing, that a particular Church may reform it ſelf, if the general will not? I had thought, and do ſo ſtill, that in point of Reformation of either Manners or Doctrine, it is lawful for the Church, ſince Chriſt, to do as the Church before Chriſt did, and might do. The Church before Chriſt conſiſted of Jews and Proſelytes: This Church came to have a ſeparation, upon a moſt ungodly Policy of* Jeroboams, *ſo that it never pieced together again. To a Common Council to reform all, they would not come. Was it not lawful for* Judah *to reform her ſelf, when* Iſrael *would not joyn? Sure it was, or elſe the Prophet deceives me, that ſays expreſly, Though* Iſrael *tranſgreſs, yet let not* Hoſ. 4. 15. *Judah ſin. And S.* Hierom *expounds it of this very particular ſin of Hereſie and Error in Religion.* After which he proves, *That* Iſrael, *during this Separation, was a true Church*, which we ſhall inſiſt on, when we have conſidered what Anſwer you return to his Lordſhips Argument; which lyes in theſe two things; Firſt, *That* Judah *did not reform her ſelf.* Secondly, P. 166. n. 2. *That* Judah *is not the Proteſtant party, as his Lordſhip ſuppoſeth it to be.* Firſt, You ſay, *Judah did not reform her ſelf. For* Judah *being the orthodox Church, united with her Head the High Prieſt, and not tainted with any Doctrinal errours, What need was there of her Reformation? And ſo the meaning of that place, Though* Iſrael *tranſgreſs, yet let not* Judah *ſin, is rather againſt, than for him, becauſe the ſenſe is rather, Let not* Judah *fall into Schiſm, though* Iſrael *does, than, let* Judah *reform her ſelf.* But if it appears that *Judah* had corruptions crept into her, as well as *Iſrael* had, though not ſo great, and univerſal, then it follows, that by theſe words *Judah* had power to reform her ſelf. And the antecedent is clear to any one who takes the pains to read the Scripture, and compare the places in it, more than it ſeems you Hoſ. 6. 47. do. For, Doth not this very Prophet check *Judah* as well as *Iſrael for* Hoſ. 12. 2. *tranſgreſſing Gods Covenant?* Doth he not ſay, *That God had a Controverſie with* Judah, *and would puniſh* Jacob *according to his ways?* And for all this, Was there no need of Reformation in the *Church* of *Judah?* Indeed Hoſ. 11. 12. in one place it is ſaid, *That* Judah *ruleth with God, and is faithful with his Saints*; but then that is to be underſtood of *Judah*, when ſhe had reformed her ſelf in the days of *Hezekiah*: for ſurely you will not ſay, That *Judah* did not ſtand in need of Reformation, when *Hezekiah* began his Reign; for it is ſaid of him, *That he removed the high places, and brake the* 2 King 18. 4. *Images, and cut down the groves.* And were not theſe, things which wanted Reformation, think you? If we conſider the times of thoſe three Hoſ. 1. 1. *Kings* before *Hezekiah*, in which *Hoſea* propheſied; we ſhall ſee, what need there was of Reformation among them, and thoſe were *Uzziah*, *Jotham*, and *Ahaz*; of the time of *Uzziah* called *Azariah*, in the Book of *Kings* it 2 King. 15. 4. is ſaid, *That the high places were not removed, but the people ſacrificed and* v. 35. *burnt Incenſe ſtill on the high places*; the ſame is affirmed of the time of *Jotham* in the ſame Chapter; ſo that though theſe *Princes* were good themſelves, yet there were many *corruptions* ſtill among the people. But of *Ahaz* 2 King. 16. 3, 4. it is ſaid expreſly, *That he walked in the way of the Kings of* Iſrael; *and he ſacrificed and burnt Incenſe in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree.* Chuſe now which of theſe three you pleaſe (for it is moſt improbable thoſe words, conſidering the long time of *Hoſea*'s Prophecy, ſhould be ſpoken in the time of *Hezekiah* the laſt of the four *Kings* he propheſied under) And will you tell us again, *That the Church of* Judah *needed*

no

no Reformation? But you offer at a reaſon for it, *Becauſe ſhe was united with her Head the High-Prieſt at* Hieruſalem. So then, belike as long as *Judah* and the *High-Prieſt* were united, ſhe could be guilty of no Doctrinal Errors: No, not although ſhe ſhould pronounce *Chriſt* a blaſphemer, and condemn him to be crucified as a malefactor; for then certainly *Judah* and the *High-Prieſt* were united. But, I know you will ſay, *You ſpake this of the time before the Meſſias was come.* And was it then true, that *as long as* Judah *was united with her Head, the High-Prieſt, there was no need of Reformation?* What think you then of the time of *Ahaz*, when *Uzziah* the *Prieſt built an Altar at the command of* Ahaz, *according to the pattern of the Altar of* Damaſcus, contrary to Gods expreſs Law: yet, according to you, *as long as* Judah *was united with her Head, the High-Prieſt*, there was nothing which needed Reformation. And, although it be plainly affirmed, that *Judah kept not the commands of the Lord their God, but walked in the ſtatutes of* Iſrael *which they had made*; yet you, who, it ſeems, knew *Judah's* Innocency better than *God*, or the *Prophets* did, ſay very magiſterially, That as long as ſhe was united with her Head the *High-Prieſt*, What need, I pray, was there of her Reformation? And this being the caſe of *Judah*, I may eaſily grant you, *That* Judah *is not the Proteſtant party, but that of the* Roman *Church*, i. e. *while* Judah *was under her corruptions*; *and yet, you ſay, ſhe needed no Reformation*, ſhe is the fitteſt parallel you could think of for your *Church*; but we pretend to no parallel between *Judah* and the *Proteſtant* party, in *not needing a Reformation*, but in her *power* to reform her ſelf Which we ſay ſtill, that ſhe had, *though* Iſrael *would not joyn with her*, by virtue of theſe words of the *Prophet*, *Though* Iſrael *tranſgreſs*, *yet let not* Judah *ſin*: thereby manifeſting, that though the greateſt part was degenerated in the *ten Tribes*, yet *Judah* might prevent the ſame in her ſelf, by reforming thoſe abuſes which were crept among them; And therefore the ſenſe of thoſe words, *Let not* Judah *ſin*, muſt in this caſe imply *a power to reform her ſelf.* If therefore we ſpeak of *Judah degenerated*, we grant the parallel lyes wholly between *Judah* and the *Church* of *Rome*; for, although there were great corruptions in *Judah*, and as great in your *Church*, yet with the ſame reaſon you ſay, That *neither needed Reformation*: But if we ſpeak of *Judah reforming her ſelf* under *Hezekiah*, then we ſay, The parallel lyes between *Judah* and the *Proteſtant party*; whatever you ſay to the contrary. But you ſhrewdly ask, *If you be* Judah, *Who, I pray, are the revolted ten Tribes? Who are of* Jeroboams *Cabal?* Even they who ſet up the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel*: Such who worſhip *Images* inſtead of the true *God*; though they intend them only as *Symbols* of the *Divine Preſence*; for no more did *Jeroboam* and the *Iſraelites* intend by their *Calves*, and there is no pretence which you uſe to juſtifie your ſelves from *Idolatry*, but will excuſe *Jeroboam*, and the *ten Tribes* from it. If the *Proteſtant party* then be *Judah*; it is eaſie finding out the revolted *ten Tribes*, and *Jeroboams Cabal*, the *Court* of *Rome* anſwering to this, as the *Church* of *Rome* doth to the other. *But we cannot be* Judah, *becauſe we left the Catholick* Jeruſalem, *that is* Rome *the City of Peace*: By whom, I pray, was *Rome Chriſtened* the *Catholick Jeruſalem?* For if we conſider the worſhip there uſed, and the politick ends of it, it much more looks like *Samaria*, or *Dan*, and *Bethel*. If *Rome* be our *Catholick Jeruſalem*, ſhew us, When *God* made choice of that, for the peculiar place of his *Worſhip?* Where we are commanded to reſort thither for Divine Worſhip? When *God* placed his *Name* there, as he did of o'd in *Jeruſalem?* When you have ſhewed us theſe things, we may think the worſe of our ſelves for leaving *Rome*, but not before. And, let the world judge, Whether it be more likely one ſhould meet with the worſhip of *Golden Calves* at *Rome*,

2 King. 16. 10, 11.

2 King. 17. 19.

Ibid.

or among the *Proteſtants?* It is you who have found out *new Sacrifices, new Objects of Worſhip, new Rites and Ceremonies* in it, *new Altars*, and conſequently *new Prieſts* too; and yet for all this, you muſt be *orthodox* Judah, *which needed no Reformation?* And who, I pray, do in point of obedience moſt reſemble the *ten Tribes?* Have not you ſet up a *ſpiritual Jeroboam*, as a new *Head* of the *Church*, in oppoſition to the *Son* of *David?* And that you may advance the Intereſt of this *ſpiritual Head*, you raiſe his authority far above that of *Kings*, and *Temporal Princes*, whom you ought to be ſubject to; declaring it in his power to excommunicate, depoſe, and abſolve ſubjects from obedience to them. And therefore is not the parallel between the *ten Tribes*, and the *Church* of *Rome*, very pat, and much to the purpoſe? But when you would ſeem to return this upon us by a falſe and ſcur-

P. 161. rilous parallel between *Jeroboam*, and that *excellent Princeſs Queen Elizabeth* in the *Reformation* of the *Church* of *England*, you only betray the badneſs of your cauſe, which makes detractions ſo neceſſary to maintain it: For as her *title* to the *Crown* was undoubted, ſo her *proceedings* in the *Reformation* were ſuch as are warranted by the *Law* of *God*, and the *Nation*; and her carriage in her reign towards *Jeſuits* and *Prieſts*, no other than what the apparent neceſſity of her own and her *Kingdoms* preſervation put her upon. But if ſhe muſt be accounted like *Jeroboam*, for *baniſhing Prieſts and Jeſuits* often convicted of treaſonable practices, upon pain of death if they were found in *England*; What muſt we think of the *Catholick Jeruſalem the City of Peace*, that ſweet and gentle Mother the *Church* of *Rome*, that hath carried her ſelf ſo peaceably towards thoſe who have diſſented from her? Witneſs the blood of ſo many hundred thouſands which ſhe hath imbrued her hands in, meerly for oppoſing her doctrines and ſuperſtitions; witneſs that excellent *School* of *Humanity* the *Inquiſition*, and the eaſie *Leſſons* ſhe teaches thoſe who come under her diſcipline there; witneſs the *proceedings* in *England* in the days of *Queen Mary*; and then let any judge if the parallel muſt be carried by cruelty towards diſſenters, which of their two *Reigns* came the neareſt that of *Jeroboam*. The only true words then that you ſay, are, *but enough of this parallel*; and more than enough too of ſuch impudent ſlanders againſt the memory of that *famous Queen*: But your *Church* would have been more unlike the *ten Tribes*, if there had not been a *lying Prophet* there.

Ibid. You diſpute very manfully againſt his Lordſhip, for aſſerting, *That* Iſrael *remained a Church after the ſeparation between* Judah *and the ten Tribes*; and yet, after you have ſpent many words about it, you yield all that he

P. 162. aſſerts; when you ſay, *That in a general ſenſe they were called the people of God, as they were* Abrahams *ſeed, according to the fleſh, by reaſon of the promiſe made to* Abraham, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy ſeed after thee.* And what is there more than this, that his Lordſhip contends for? for he never dreamt that the *ten Tribes* were *Abraham's ſeed according to the Spirit*; but only ſays, *That there was ſalvation for thoſe thouſands that had not bowed their knees to* Baal, *which cannot be in the ordinary way where there is no Church.* And if, as you ſay, *Abrahams ſeed only according to the Spirit*, i. e. the *faithful* make *the true Church*; then it follows, Where there were ſo many faithful, there muſt needs be a *true Church.* And thus for any thing you have ſaid to the contrary, his Lordſhips argument from the caſe of *Judah* holds for every particular *Churches* power to reform it ſelf, when the *General* will not reform.

§. 6. His Lordſhip further argues, *That to reform what is amiſs in Doctrine*

P. 150. n. 2. *or Manners, is as lawful for a particular Church, as it is to publiſh and promulgate any thing that is Catholick in either. And your Queſtion,* Quô judice? *lies alike againſt both. And yet, I think,* ſaith he, *It may be proved, that*

that the Church of Rome, *and that as a particular Church, did promulgate an orthodox truth, which was not then Catholickly admitted in the Church; namely, the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son. If ſhe erred in this fact, confeſs her error; if ſhe erred not, Why may not another particular Church do as ſhe did?* From whence he infers, *That if a particular Church may publiſh any thing that is Catholick, where the whole Church is ſilent; it may reform any thing that is not Catholick, where the whole Church is negligent, or will not.* p. 162. n. 3.
Now to this you anſwer, 1. *That this proceſſion from the Son, was a truth always acknowledged in the Church;* but what concerns that, *and the time of this Article being inſerted into the Creed,* have been ſo amply diſcuſſed p. 164.
already, that I ſhall not cloy the reader with any repetition, having fully conſidered whatever you here ſay concerning the Article it ſelf, or its addition to the Creed. 2. You anſwer, *That the conſequence will not hold,* p. 163.
that if a particular Church may in ſome caſe promulgate an orthodox truth, not as yet Catholickly received by the Church, then a particular Church may repeal, or reverſe any thing that the whole Church hath already Catholickly and definitively received? Surely no. Yet this (ſay you) *is his Lordſhips, and the Proteſtants caſe.* You do well to mention an *egregious fallacy* preſently after theſe words; for ſurely this is ſo. For doth his Lordſhip parallel the *promulgating* ſomething *Catholick,* and *repealing* ſomething *Catholick* together? Surely no. But the *promulgating* ſomething true, but not *Catholickly* received with the *reforming* ſomething not *Catholick.* Either therefore you had a mind to abuſe his Lordſhips words, or to deceive the reader by begging the thing in Queſtion, *viz. that all thoſe which we call for a Reformation of, were things Catholickly and definitively received by the whole Church:* which you know we utterly deny. But you go on, and ſay, *That thence it follows not, that a particular Church may reform any thing that is not Catholick, where the whole Church is negligent, or will not, becauſe this would ſuppoſe error, or ſomething uncatholick, to be taught or admitted by the whole Church.* To put this caſe a little more plainly by the former Inſtance; Suppoſe then that the Worſhip of *God* under the ſymbols of the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel,* had been received generally as the viſible worſhip of the *Tribes* of *Judah,* and *Benjamin,* as well as the reſt; Doth not this Anſwer of yours make it impoſſible that ever they ſhould return to the true Worſhip of *God?* For this were to call in queſtion the truth of *Gods Promiſe* to his *Church;* and *to ſuppoſe ſomething not Catholick to be received by the whole Church.* And ſo the greater the *corruptions* are, the more impoſſible it is to cure them; and in caſe they ſpread generally, no attempts of Reformation can be lawful: which is a more falſe and paradoxical Doctrine than either of thoſe which you call ſo. And the truth is, ſuch pretences as theſe are, are fit only for a *Church* that hateth to be reformed; for if ſomething not good in it ſelf, ſhould happen in any one age to overſpread the viſible Communion of all particular *Churches,* this only makes a Reformation the more neceſſary; ſo far is it from making it the more diſputable. For thereby thoſe corruptions grow more dangerous, and every particular *Church* is bound the more to regard its own ſecurity in a time of general Infection. And if any other *Churches* neglect themſelves, What reaſon is it that the reſt ſhould? For, any or all other particular *Churches* neglecting their duty, is no more an argument, that no particular *Church* ſhould reform it ſelf, than that if all other men in a *Town* neglect preſerving themſelves from the Plague, then I am bound to neglect it too. But you anſwer, 3. *That all this doth not juſtifie the Proteſtants proceedings, becauſe they promulged only new and unheard of Doctrines, directly contrary to what the Catholick Church univerſally held and taught before them for Catholick Truths.* This is the great thing in Queſtion; but I ſee, you love

b.ſt

beſt the lazy trade of begging things, which are impoſſible to be rationally proved.

§. 7. Ibid. But yet you would ſeem here to do ſomething towards it in the ſubſequent words; *For about the year of our Lord* 1517. *when their pretended Reformations began, was not the real preſence of our Saviours body and blood in the Euchariſt, by a true ſubſtantial change of Bread and Wine, generally held by the whole Church? Was not the real Sacrifice of the Maſs then generally believed? Was not Veneration of Holy Images, Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Praying for the dead, that they might be eaſed of their pains, and receive the full remiſſion of their ſins generally uſed and practiſed by all Chriſtians? Was not Free will, Merit of good works, and Juſtification by Charity, or inherent Grace, and not by Faith only, univerſally taught and believed in all Churches of Chriſtendom? Yea even among thoſe who in ſome few other points diſſented from the Pope, and the Latin Church? To what purpoſe then doth the Biſhop urge, that a particular Church may publiſh any thing that is Catholick? This doth not juſtifie at all his Reformation; he ſhould prove that it may not only add, but take away ſomething that is Catholick from the Doctrine of the Church; for this the pretended Reformers did, as well in* England *as elſewhere.* His Lordſhip never pretends, much leſs diſputes, that any particular *Church* hath a power to take away any thing that is truly *Catholick*; but the ground why he ſuppoſeth, ſuch things as thoſe mentioned by you, might be taken away, is, becauſe they are not *Catholick*; the Queſtion then is between us, Whether they were *Catholick Doctrines* or not: this you attempt to prove by this *medium*, *Becauſe they were generally held by the whole Church at the time of the Reformation.* To which I anſwer, 1. If this be a certain meaſure to judge by, what was *Catholick* and what not; then what doth not appear to have been *Catholick* in this ſenſe, it was in our *Churches* power to reject, and ſo it was lawful to reform our ſelves as to all ſuch things which were not at the time of the *Reformation* received by the whole *Church.* And what think you now of the *Popes Supremacy*, your *Churches Infallibility*, the *neceſſity of Cœlibate in the Clergy*, *Communion in one kind*, *Prayer in an unknown tongue*, *Indulgences*, &c. Will you ſay, That thoſe were generally received by the *Church* at the time of the Reformation? If you could have ſaid ſo, no doubt you would not have omitted ſuch neceſſary points, and ſome of which gave the firſt occaſion to the *Reformation.* If then theſe were not *Catholickly* received, a particular *Church* might without *Schiſm* reject them, and ſo the *Church* of *England* is ſufficiently vindicated from *Schiſm* by your ſelf, as to theſe points here mentioned; which you willingly omitted, becauſe you could not but know how far they were from being univerſally received in all *Churches* in *Chriſtendom?*

2. As to thoſe things which you inſiſt on, you give no ſufficient evidence at all, that they were received by the *whole Church as Catholick Doctrines.* For, ſo far it is from appearing, that theſe were held as *Catholick Doctrines* by all *Churches* in the Chriſtian world (for then you do moſt unreaſonably condemn the *Greek*, and *Abyſſine Churches*, &c. for *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*, if they owned all *Catholick Doctrines*; and they muſt do ſo, if they agreed with your *Church* in all theſe things which are the only Doctrines you mention as *Catholick*, in oppoſition to ſuch whom you condemn for *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*; and if the agreement of all *Churches* be the meaſure of what is *Catholick*, then thoſe Doctrines cannot be ſo, which thoſe great *Churches* differ from you in, by your own argument) but, ſo far is it, I ſay, from appearing, that theſe were held ſo by all *Churches* in *Chriſtendom*, that you cannot prove they were ſo held in the *Church* of *Rome* her ſelf, before the Reformation. The *Church* of *Rome* I take here in the largeſt ſenſe, as it takes in all ſuch who were the viſible members of her Communion.

nion. Now, I hope you will not say, that such *Doctrines* are received as *Catholick Doctrines*, which are imbraced only by a party in *your Church*, another party opposing it, both which still remain members of your Communion; for whatever is received as a *Catholick Doctrine* (according to you) is so received, that those who deny or doubt of it, do thereby become no members of the visible Communion of that *Church*; which is by the *Churches* so declaring her self in those points, that she admits none to her Communion, but upon the acknowledgement of them. Now, Will you say, This was the case of your *Church*, as to these Doctrines at the beginning of the *Reformation?* Were *Transubstantiation*, *real Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, *Veneration of Images*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, &c. so defined then by your *Church* to be Articles of *Faith*, that whoever did not assent to them, was declared excommunicate, and cast out of your *Church?* If not, it is impossible, upon your own grounds, to prove, that these were universally held and believed as *Catholick Doctrines* of your *Church*. I do not say, As *truly Catholick Doctrines* in themselves; for, whatever your *Church* defines concerning them, they are not more or less so in themselves for your *Churches* definition; but, I say, you cannot assert that these were held by your *Church* to be *Catholick Doctrines*, till they were defined to be such. For, according to your principles, that which differenceth a *Catholick Doctrine* from a particular Opinion, is the *Churches Definition*; before then the *Church* had passed a definition in these points, they could not be held as *Catholick Doctrines*. To make this somewhat clearer, because it is necessary for undeceiving those who are told, as you tell us here, That at the Reformation we rejected such things which were universally owned for *Catholick Doctrines*, which is so far from being true, that it is impossible they should be owned for such by the *Church* of *Rome* upon your own principles. For, I pray, tell us, Are there not several sorts of Opinions among you at this day, none of which are pretended to be *Catholick Doctrines?* and this you constantly tell us, when we object to you your dissentions about them. As for Instance, the *Popes personal Infallibility*, the *Superiority of Pope over General Councils*, the *Immaculate Conception* of the *Blessed Virgin*, the Disputes about *Prædestination*, &c. when we tell you of your differences in these points, you answer, That these hinder not the *Unity* of the *Church*, because these are only in matters of Opinion; and that it is not *de fide*, that men should hold either way. When we demand the reason of this difference concerning these things, your Answer is, *That the Church hath defined some things to be believed, and not others; that what the Church hath defined, is to be looked on as Catholick Doctrine, and the deniers of it are guilty of Heresie; but where the Church hath not defined, those are not Catholick Doctrines, but only at best but pious Opinions, and men may be good Catholicks, and yet differ about them.* I pray, tell me, Is this your Doctrine, or, is it not? If not, there may be *Hereticks* within your *Church*, as well as without: if it be your Doctrine, apply it to the matters in hand. Were these things defined by the *Church* at the beginning of the *Reformation?* If they were, produce those *Definitions* for all those things which you say were owned as *Catholick Doctrines* then: that we may see, that at least in the judgement of your *Church* they were accounted so. Tell us, when and where those Doctrines were defined before the *Council* of *Trent?* and, I hope you will not say, that was before the beginning of the *Reformation*. If then there were no such definitions concerning them, they could not by your *Church* be accounted as *Catholick Doctrines*; at the most, they could be but only *pious Opinions*, as that of the *Popes Infallibility* among you is, and consequently men might be *Catholicks* still, though they disputed or denied them. And how then come the *Protestants* to be accounted

Hereticks

Heretick in their *Reformation*, if upon your own principles, thoſe things which they denied were then no *Catholick Doctrines*: Though you ſhould therefore prove more than you have done, That theſe points of *Doctrine* were generally received at the time of the *Reformation*, yet that by no means proves that they were *Catholick Doctrines*, unleſs you make it impoſſible that meer *Opinions* ſhould be generally received in your *Church*. For, if any thing may be generally received in the nature of an *Opinion*, you cannot prove from the bare general reception, that it was a *Catholick Doctrine*: unleſs you would attempt to prove it by the notion under which it was received, Whether as an Opinion, or a *Catholick Doctrine*.

§. 8. But then you muſt remember to prove theſe things, 1. That all thoſe who did receive it, received it under that *notion*; as for inſtance, In any one of thoſe Articles by you mentioned, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, &c. you muſt firſt prove, That all who were in your *Churches* Communion did believe thoſe things; which it is impoſſible for you to do, unleſs you could prove, that none could be of your *Church*, unleſs they believed them; which is again impoſſible to be done, unleſs your *Church* had ſo defined thoſe things, that they ceaſed to be members of it who did not believe them. Thus, we ſee, your firſt task is rendred impoſſible, *viz.* to know, Whether all in your *Church* held theſe Doctrines or no; but, ſuppoſe you knew this, it falls ſhort of your purpoſe, unleſs you can prove, that all thoſe who held theſe things, did not hold them as bare Opinions, but as *Catholick Doctrines*; and this is again as impoſſible as the former; for, How can you tell, whether they judged theſe things to be ſo, unleſs you knew what their *Rule* was whereby they judged of *Catholick Doctrines*? If you knew their Rule, How can you tell, Whether they made a right *Uſe* of it or no? or, Whether they made any Uſe at all of it? or, Whether they did not take up ſuch Opinions by prejudice, education, the judgement of others, and ſeveral other ways, without examining of what nature or importance the things were. If you think you have a certain Rule to judge of *Catholick Doctrines* by, you muſt prove that they had the ſame Rule, and looked upon it as ſuch too: otherwiſe they might not uſe it for thoſe ends, nor be governed at all by it. When you will therefore prove any Doctrines to be *Catholick*, by being generally received, you muſt remember what brave impoſſibilities you have undertaken. But, ſuppoſe you could maſter this too, and prove, that men generally received theſe as *Catholick Doctrines*; yet, before you can prove, that theſe are *Catholick Doctrines* from thence, you have a further task yet upon you, which is, to prove it impoſſible that theſe men ſhould be *out* in their judgement concerning the nature of an Opinion, and that they could not look on any thing as a *Catholick Doctrine*, but what was really ſo. For, if they may be miſtaken in their judgement, we are as far to ſeek as ever, for knowing what are *Catholick Doctrines*, and what not. You muſt therefore prove the judgement of all theſe perſons *infallible* concerning what are *Catholick Doctrines*, and what not: And by that time, the *Pope* will return you little thanks for your pains, in making every member of your *Church* as *infallible* as himſelf. If it be then ſo impoſſible to prove, that theſe were received as *Catholick Doctrines*, either from any definition of your *Church*, or from the general reception of them among the members of it, you ſee, what little reaſon you had to ſay, *That the Proteſtants at the beginning of the Reformation, did take away ſomething that was Catholick from the Doctrine of the Church.* Which is notoriouſly falſe and inconſiſtent with your own principles. If we ſhould therefore grant, that *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, &c. *were generally owned in your Church at the time of the Reformation*, the utmoſt you can prove, is, only that they were owned as *particular Doctrines*

Doctrines by particular men, but not that they were owned as the *Catholick Doctrines* of your *Church*. And therefore we deny not, but that *party* and *faction* in your *Church* which owned and contended for these, had got the upper-hand of the other, before the time of the Reformation, so that those who doubted of, or denied them, durst not appear so publickly as their adversaries did; but they were but a *party*, and a *faction* still, and there were many outward members of your *Church*, who groaned under the abuses and tyrannies of the prevailing *faction*, and call'd loud for a *Reformation*. As appeared not only by the open testimonies of some against such Doctrines; the sad complaint of others for want of Reformation; but by the general sense of the necessity of it, at the time when it was set upon, the great applause it met with among all persons who allowed themselves liberty to enquire into things, the general consent of the main bodies of those who set about reforming themselves in the main Articles of *Christian Doctrine*, and *unanimous opposition* to those erroneous Opinions which you call *Catholick Doctrines*. So that these were not at the time of the Reformation, so much as the owned *Catholick Doctrines* of the *Roman Church*; but the Opinions of a *prevailing Faction* in it: and therefore the disowning them, is no rejecting any thing *Catholick*, but rejecting the opinions and practices of a tyrannical and usurping Faction. There must be then a great deal of difference put between the State and Doctrine of the *Church* of *Rome*, before the beginning of the Reformation, and since, especially since the *Council* of *Trent*. For then these *Doctrines* were owned by a *Faction*, but yet there might have been communion with that *Church*, without believing them to be *Catholick Doctrines*; and no doubt, many pious souls went to Heaven without believing any of these things, (*viz.* such who believed and improved the common principles of *Christianity*, without regarding the erroneous Doctrines, or superstitious Practices of those among who they lived) but upon the first stirrings towards a *Reformation*, the *Court* of *Rome* was so far from reforming the abuses which were complained of, that they sought to inforce them with the greatest severity upon all persons, thundering out Excommunications against all such who should question or dispute them. By which means those who might have lived peaceably before within the external Communion of that *Church*, without consenting to the errors of it, are now forced out of it, unless they would approve of such things which their consciences detested; in comparison with the peace of which, they accounted not their lives to be dear to them, as many thousands of them made it appear in several Countries. This is the true and just account of the state of things at the begining of the *Reformation*; but afterwards, when, through the necessity of the *Pope*'s affairs, a *Council* was summoned, and all the arts imaginable were made use of, to steer that grand affair for the *Interest* of the *Court* of *Rome*; a new *scene* of affairs appears in the *Christian* world: those Doctrines which before were owned only by particular men, are defined by *Pope* and *Council*, to be the *Catholick Doctrines* of the *Roman Church*, and all those *Anathematized* who will not own them. By which means the *Roman Church* is become it self that *party* and *faction*, which only prevailed in it before but with reluctancy and opposition; and now, none are looked on as members of that *Church*, but such as own the definitions of that *Council* in point of Doctrine. Which makes it vastly to differ from what it was before, as to the terms of its Communion, and the state of the persons who remain in it; who can neither enjoy that freedom in judgement which they might use before, nor yet can pretend those excuses for not knowing the errors and corruptions of that *Church*, which might have prevented obstinacy in them before. So that upon the whole

it appears, that the *Proteſtants* in the beginning of the *Reformation*, were ſo far from taking away any thing that was received as a *Catholick Doctrine*, by all *Chriſtian Churches*, that they did not reject any thing which could be looked on as the *Catholick Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome*; and conſequently that the *Proteſtants* were ſo far from a wilful ſeparation from the *Church* of *Rome*, that they were driven out by a prevalent *Faction*, which impoſed thoſe things which had been before only the errors of particular perſons, as the *Catholick Doctrines* of that *Church*, and the neceſſary conditions of Communion with her.

3. I may anſwer yet further, That it is not enough to prove any Doctrine to be *Catholick*, that it was generally received by *Chriſtian Churches* in any one *Age*; but it muſt be made appear, to have been ſo received from the *Apoſtles times*. So that if we ſhould grant, that theſe *Doctrines* were owned for *Catholick*, not only by the *Church* of *Rome*, but all other *Chriſtian Churches* (ſo far as it can be diſcerned by their Communion) yet this doth not prove theſe Doctrines ſo owned to be *truly Catholick*, unleſs you can firſt prove, that all the *Chriſtian Churches of one Age* can never believe a Doctrine to be *Catholick*, which is not ſo. You ſee therefore your task increaſes further upon you: for, it is not enough to ſay, That *A. D.* 1517. ſuch and ſuch Doctrines were looked on as *Catholick*, and therefore they were ſo; but that for 1517. years, ſucceſſively from the *Apoſtles* to that time, they were judged to be ſo, and then we ſhall more eaſily believe you. When you will therefore prove *Tranſubſtantiation*, the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *Image-worſhip*, *Invocation of Saints*, or any other of the good Doctrines mentioned by you, in a conſtant tradition from the *Apoſtles* times to have been looked on as *Catholick Doctrines*, you may then ſay, That *Proteſtants* in denying theſe, did take away ſomething *Catholick* from the Doctrine of the *Church*; but, till that time, theſe Anſwers may abundantly ſuffice.

§. 9. We now come cloſer to the buſineſs of the *Reformation*; but, before we examine the particulars of it, the *general grounds* on which it proceeded, muſt ſomewhat further be cleared, which his Lordſhip tells you, are

P. 164. n. 6. built *upon the power of particular Churches reforming themſelves, in caſe the whole Church is negligent, or will not*; to which you ſay, *That you grant in effect as great power as the Biſhop himſelf does, to particular Churches, to National and Provincial Councils, in reforming errors and abuſes either of doctrine or practice: only we require that they proceed with due reſpect to the chief Paſtor of the Church, and have recourſe to him in all matters and decrees of Faith, eſpecially when they define or declare points not generally known and acknowledged to be Catholick Truths.* What you grant *in effect* at firſt, you *in effect* deny again afterwards. For the Queſtion is about Reformation of ſuch errors and abuſes as may come from the *Church* of *Rome*; and when you grant a power to reform only, in caſe the *Pope* conſent, you grant no power to reform at all. For the experience of the world hath ſufficiently taught us, How little his conſent is to be expected in any thing of Reformation. For his Lordſhip truly ſaith, in Anſwer to *Capellus*, who denies particular *Churches* any power of making *Canons* of Faith, without conſulting

P. 151. n. 3. the *Roman ſee*, *That as* Capellus *can never prove that the* Roman *See muſt be conſulted with before any Reformation be made: So it is as certain, that, were it proved and practiſed, we ſhould have no Reformation. For it would be long enough before the Church ſhould be cured, if that See alone ſhould be her Phyſitian, which in truth is her diſeaſe.* Now to this you ſay, *That even* Capellus *himſelf requires this*: as though *Capellus* were not the man whom his Lordſhip anſwers as to this very thing. But beſides you ſay, *The practice of the Church is evident for it, in the examples of the Milevitan and Carthaginian Councils, which, as St.* Auſtin *witneſſeth, ſent their decrees*

touching

touching Grace, Original ſin in Infants, and other matters againſt Pelagius, *to be confirmed by the Pope*: but what is all this to the buſineſs of Reformation, that nothing of that nature is to be attempted without the *Popes* conſent? That theſe *Councils* did by *Julius* an *African Biſhop* communicate their decrees to *Pope Innocent*, who denies? but, what is it you would thence infer to your purpoſe? for the utmoſt which can be drawn hence, is, that they deſired the *Pope* to contribute his aſſiſtance in condemning *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius*; by adding the authority of the *Apoſtolical See* to their decrees: that ſo by the conſent of the *Church* that growing Hereſie might the more eaſily be ſuppreſſed. And who denies but at that time the *Roman Church* had great reputation, (which is all that *Authority* implies) and by that means might be more ſerviceable in preventing the growth of *Pelagianſm*, if it did concur with the *African Councils* in condemning that Doctrine? But becauſe they communicated their decrees to *Pope Innocent* deſiring his conſent with them, that therefore no reformation ſhould be attempted in the *Church* without the conſent of the *Pope* is a very far-fetched inference; and unhappily drawn from thoſe *African Fathers*, who ſo ſtoutly oppoſed *Zoſimus*, *Innocents* Succeſſour, in the caſe of *Appeals* about the buſineſs of *Apiarius*. Did they, think you, look on themſelves as obliged to do nothing in the reforming the *Church* without the *Popes* authority, who would by no means yield to thoſe encroachments of power, which *Zoſimus* would have uſurped over them? Nay it appears, that, till the *African Fathers* had better informed him, *Zoſimus* did not a little favour *Cœleſtius* himſelf, and in caſe he had gone on ſo to do, do you think they would have thought themſelves ever the leſs obliged to reform their *Churches* from the *Pelagian Hereſie* which began to ſpread among them? And in this time of the Controverſie between *Zoſimus* and them, though they carried it with all fairneſs towards the *Roman See*, yet they were ſtill careful to preſerve and defend their own priviledges; and in caſe the *Pope* ſhould then have challenged that power over them, which he hath done ſince, no doubt they would not have ſtuck at calling ſuch incroachments *The diſeaſe of the Church*, (without any unhandſomeneſs or incivility) and would have been far from looking on him as the only *Phyſician* of it.

To that pretence, *That things ſhould have been born with, till the time of a General Council*, his Lordſhip anſwers: *Firſt, 'tis true, a General Council, free and entire, would have been the beſt remedy, and moſt able for a Gangrene that had ſpread ſo far, and eaten ſo deep into Chriſtianity. But what? ſhould we have ſuffered this Gangrene to endanger life and all, rather than be cured in time by a Phyſician of weaker knowledge, and a leſs able hand? Secondly we live to ſee ſince, if we had ſtayed and expected a General Council, what manner of one we ſhould have had if any. For that at* Trent *was neither General nor free. And for the errors which* Rome *had contracted, it confirmed them, it cured them not. And yet I much doubt, whether ever that Council (ſuch as it was) would have been call'd, if ſome Provincial and National Synods under Supreme and Regal power, had not firſt ſet upon this great work of Reformation; which I heartily wiſh had been as orderly and happily purſued as the work was right Chriſtian and good in it ſelf. But humane frailty and the heats and diſtempers of men, as well as the cunning of the Devil would not ſuffer that. For even in this ſenſe alſo the wrath of man doth not accompliſh the will of God, S.* James 1. 20. *but I have learnt not to reject the good which God hath wrought, for any evil which men may faſten upon it.* Now to this you anſwer, 1. By a fair Conceſſion again, *that a Provincial Council is the next Chirurgion, when a Gangrene endangers life, but ſtill the Popes aſſiſtance is required:* For fear the *Chirurgion* ſhould do too much good of himſelf,

§. 10. P. 152. n. 4.

P. 163.

himſelf, you would be ſure to have the *Pope* as *Phyſitian* to ſtand by, whom you know too much concerned in the maladies of the *Church*, to give way to an effectual cure. 2. But you ſay further, *That the moſt proper expedient is an Oecumenical Council*; and this you ſpoil again, with ſaying; *Such as the Council of Trent was.* For what you ſay in vindication of that being *General and free*, we ſhall conſider in the *Chapter* deſigned for that purpoſe. What you object againſt our *National Synod* 1562. will be fully anſwered before the end of *this*; which that we may make way for, we muſt proceed to the remainder of theſe general grounds; in which his
P. 152. n. 5. Lordſhip proves, *That when the Univerſal Church will not, or for the iniquity of the times cannot obtain and ſettle a free General Council, 'tis lawful, nay ſometimes neceſſary to reform groſs abuſes by a National or a Provincial.* To
P. 166. n. 8. this you anſwer in General, *That you deny not but matters of leſs moment as concerning rites and ceremonies, abuſes in manners and diſcipline, may be reformed by particular Councils, without expreſs leave of the Pope; but that in matters of great moment concerning the Faith and publick Doctrine of the Church, Sacraments, and whatever elſe is of Divine Inſtitution, or univerſal obligation, particular Councils, (if they duly proceed) attempt nothing without recourſe to the See Apoſtlick, and the Popes conſent either expreſly granted or juſtly preſumed.* Fair hopes then there are of a cure when the *Impoſthume* gathers in the *Head!* we are indeed by this put into a very good condition; for if a ſmall matter hurts a *Church*, ſhe hath her hands at liberty to help her ſelf; but if one comes to *raviſh* her, her hands are tyed, and by no means muſt ſhe defend her ſelf. For in caſe, ſay you, it be *any matter of great moment, it muſt be left to the Pope, and nothing to be done without his conſent*; no not although the main of the diſtempers come through him. But thanks be to *God*, our *Church* is not committed to the hands of ſuch a mercileſs *Phyſitian*, who firſt cauſeth the *malady* and then forbids the *cure*: we know of no ſuch obligation we have, to *ſleep* in S. *Peters Church*, as of old they did in the *Temple* of *Eſculapius* in hopes of a *cure*. *God* hath entruſted every *National Church* with the care of her own ſafety, and will require of her an account of that power he hath given to that end. It will be little comfort to a *Church* whoſe *members rot* for want of a *remedy*, to ſay, *The Pope will not give leave* or elſe it might have been cured. I wonder where it is that any *Chriſtian Church* is commanded to wait the *Popes* good leaſure for reforming her ſelf? Whence doth he derive this Authority and ſole power of reforming *Churches*? But that muſt be afterwards examined. But is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe that there ſhould be *Chriſtian Magiſtrates*, and *Chriſtian Biſhops* in *Churches*, and yet theſe ſo tyed up, that they can do nothing in order to the *Churches* recovery though the diſtempers be never ſo great and dangerous? Do we not read in the *Apoſtolical Churches* that the Government of them was in themſelves, without any the leaſt mention of any *Oecumenical Paſtor* over all? If any abuſes were among them, the particular *Governours* of thoſe *Churches* are checked and rebuked for it, and commanded to exerciſe their power over offenders? and muſt the encroachments of an uſurped and arbitrary power in the *Church* hinder particular *Churches* from the exerciſe of that full power which is committed to the *Governors* of them? Neither is this only a Right granted to a *Church* as ſuch, but we find this power practiſed and aſſerted in the hiſtory of the *Chriſtian Churches* from the *Apoſtles* times. For no ſooner did the *Biſhops* of *Rome* begin to encroach, but other *Biſhops* were ſo mindful of their own priviledges and the *Intereſs* of their *Churches*, that they did not yield themſelves his *Vaſſals*, but diſputed their *rights* and withſtood his uſurpations. As hath partly appeared already, and will do more afterwards.

And

§. 11. And that particular *Churches* may reform themſelves, his Lordſhip produceth ſeveral Teſtimonies; The firſt is of *Gerſon*, who tells us plainly, P. 153. *That he will not deny, but that the Church may be reformed by parts. And that this is neceſſary; and, that to effect it, Provincial Councils may ſuffice, and in ſome things Dioceſan.* And again, *Either you ſhould reform all eſtates of the Church in a General Council, or command them to be reformed in Provincial Councils: But all this*, you ſay, *doth not concern matters of Faith, but* P. 167. *only perſonal abuſes*; But I pray what ground is there that one ſhould be reformed and not the other? Is it not the reaſon why any reformation is neceſſary, that the *Churches* purity and ſafety ſhould be preſerved? and is not that as much or more endangered by erroneous doctrines than by perſonal abuſes? Will not then the parity of reaſon hold proportionably for one as well as the other? That if the *Church* may be reformed by parts as to leſſer abuſes, then much more certainly as to greater. *Beſides*, you ſay, *Gerſon allowed no Schiſmatical Reformations againſt the Churches head*; neither do we plead for any ſuch; but then you muſt ſhew, Who the *Churches head* is, and, By what right he comes to be ſo; otherwiſe the cauſe of the *Schiſm* will fall upon him who pretends to be the *head* to direct others, and is as corrupt a *member* as any in the body. But his Lordſhip adds, *This right of Provincial Synods, that they might decree in cauſes of* Ibid. *Faith, and in caſes of Reformation, where corruptions had crept into the Sacraments of Chriſt, was practiſed much above a thouſand years ago by many, both National and Provincial Synods.* For which he firſt inſtanceth in the *Council at* Rome *under Pope* Sylveſter *An.* 324. *condemning* Photinus *and* Sabellius, *whoſe hereſies were of a high nature againſt the Faith*; but here you ſay, *the very title confutes his pretence, for it was held under the Pope* Ibid. *and therefore not againſt him.* But however, whether with the *Pope* or againſt him, it was no more than a *Provincial Synod*; and this decreed ſomething in matters of Faith, though according to your own Doctrine the *Pope* could not be Infallible there: for you reſtrain his *Infallibility* to a *General Council*, and do not aſſert that it belongs to the particular *Church* of *Rome*. As well then may any other Provincial *Synod* determine matters of Faith, as that of *Rome*, ſince that hath no more Infallibility belonging to it as ſuch than any other particular *Church* hath; and the *Pope* himſelf you ſay may err when he doth not define matters of Faith in a *General Council*. To his Lordſhips ſecond inſtance *of the Council of* Gangra *about the ſame time condemning* Euſtathius *for his condemning marriage as unlawful*; you anſwer to the ſame purpoſe, *That* Oſius *was there Pope* Sylveſter's *Legat*; but what then? if the *Pope* had been there himſelf he had not been Infallible, much leſs certainly his *Legat* who could have only a *Second-hand Infallibility*. To the third of the *Council of* Carthage *condemning rebaptization about* 348. you grant, *That it was aſſembled by* Gratus *Biſhop of* Carthage, *but that no new Article was defined in it, but only the perpetual tradition of the Church was confirmed therein.* Neither do we plead for any power in *Provincial Councils* to define any *new Articles of Faith*, but only to revive the old, and to confirm them in oppoſition to any *Innovations* in point of Doctrine; and as to this we profeſs to be guided by the ſenſe of *Scripture* as interpreted by the unanimous conſent of the *Fathers* and the *four firſt General Councils*. To the fourth of the *Council of Aquileia A. D.* 381. *condemning* Palladius *and* Secundinus *for embracing the Arrian Hereſie*, *St.* Ambroſe *being preſent*; you anſwer, *That they only condemned thoſe who had been condemned already by the* Nicene *Council*; *and*, *St.* Ambroſe *and other Biſhops of* Italy *being preſent, Who can doubt but every thing was done there by the Popes authority and conſent?* But if they only enforced the decrees of the *Council* of *Nice*, What need of the *Popes* authority

rity to do that? And do you think that there were no *Provincial Councils* in that part of *Italy* which was particularly diſtinguiſhed from the *ſuburbicarian Churches* under the *Biſhop of Rome*, wherein the *Pope* was not preſent either by himſelf or Legats? If you think ſo, your thoughts have more of your *will* than *underſtanding* in them. But if this *Council* proceeded according to that of *Nice*, Will it not be as lawful for other Provincial *Councils* to reform particular *Churches*, as long as they keep to the Decrees not barely of *Nice*, but of the four *General Councils*, which the *Church* of *England* looks on as her duty to do? In the two following Inſtances of the ſecond *Council of* Carthage *declaring in behalf of the Trinity, and the Milevitan Council about the Pelagian Hereſie*; you ſay, *The Biſhops of* Rome *were conſulted*: But what then? Were they conſulted as the *Heads* of the *Church*, or only as eminent *members* of it in regard of their Faith and Piety? Prove the former when you are able; and as to the latter it depends upon the continuance of that Faith and Piety in them; and when once the reaſon is taken away, there can be no neceſſity of continuing the ſame reſort. The ſame anſwer will ſerve for what you ſay concerning the ſecond *Council of Aurange*, *determining the Controverſies about Grace and Free-will*, ſuppoſing we grant it aſſembled by the means of *Felix* 4. *Biſhop of Rome*; as likewiſe to the *third of Toledo*. We come
P. 154. therefore to that which you call *his Lordſhips reſerve, and Maſter-allegation, the fourth Council of Toledo*; which, ſaith he, *did not only handle matters of Faith for the reformation of that people, but even added alſo ſomething to the Creed, which were not expreſly delivered in former Creeds. Nay, the Biſhops did not only practiſe this, to condemn Hereſies in National and Provincial Synods, and ſo to reform thoſe ſeveral places and the Church it ſelf by parts; but they did openly challenge this as their right and due, and that without any*
Concil. Toled. 4. Can. 3. *leave asked of the See of* Rome. *For in this fourth Council of* Toledo *they decree, that, If there happen a cauſe of Faith to be ſetled, a general that is a National Synod of all* Spain *and* Gallicia *ſhall be held thereon. And this in the year* 643. *where you ſee it was then Catholick Doctrine in all* Spain, *that a National Synod might be a competent Judge in a cauſe of Faith.* But here
P. 168. ſtill we meet with the ſame Anſwer, *That all this might be done with a due ſubordination to the See Apoſtolick, but that it doth not hence follow that any thing may be done in Provincial Councils againſt the authority of it.* Neither do we plead that any thing may be done againſt the *juſt* authority of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, or any other *Biſhop*; but then you muſt prove that he had a *juſt authority* over the *Church* of *England*, and that he exerciſed no power here at the Reformation but what did of *right* belong to him. But the fuller debate of theſe things muſt be left to that place where you deſignedly aſſert and vindicate the *Pope's Authority*.

§. 12. Theſe things being thus in the general cleared, we come to the particular application of them to the caſe of the *Church* of *England*. As to
Ibid. which, his Lordſhip ſayes; *And if this were practiſed ſo often and in ſo many places, Why may not a National Council of the Church of* England *do the like? As ſhe did. For ſhe caſt off the Pope's uſurpation, and as much as in her lay reſtored the King to his right. That appears by a Book ſubſcribed by the Biſhops in* Henry *the eighths time. And by the Records in the Archbiſhops office, orderly kept and to be ſeen. In the Reformation which came after, our Princes had their parts, and the Clergy theirs. And to theſe two principally the power and direction for Reformation belongs. That our Princes had their parts, is manifeſt by their calling together of the Biſhops, and others of the Clergy, to conſider of that which might ſeem worthy Reformation. And the Clergy did their part: for, being thus called together by Regal power, they met in the National Synod of ſixty two. And the Articles there agreed on were afterwards*

P. 155. The inſtitution of a Chriſtian man. *A.* 1534. *In Synodo Londin. Seſſ. 8. die Veneris Jan. An.* 1532.

con-

confirmed by acts of State, and the Royal assent. In this Synod, the Positive truths which are delivered are more than the Polemicks. So that a meer calumny it is, that we profess only a Negative Religion. True it is, and we must thank Rome *for it, our Confession must needs contain some Negatives. For we cannot but deny that Images are to be adored. Nor can we admit maimed Sacraments. Nor grant Prayers in an unknown tongue. And in a corrupt time or place, 'tis as necessary in Religion to deny falshood, as to assert and vindicate Truth. Indeed this latter can hardly be well and sufficiently done but by the former, an Affirmative verity being ever included in the Negative to a falshood. As for any error which might fall into this (as any other Reformation) if any such can be found; then I say, and 'tis most true, Reformation, especially in cases of Religion, is so difficult a work, and subject to so many Pretensions, that 'tis almost impossible but the Reformers should step too far, or fall too short in some smaller things or other, which in regard of the far greater benefit coming by the Reformation it self, may well be passed over and born withall. But if there have been any wilfull and gross errors, not so much in opinion as in Fact (Sacrilege too often pretending to Reform Superstition) that's the crime of the Reformers, not of the Reformation; and they are long since gone to God to answer it, to whom I leave them.*

This is his Lordships full and just account of the proceedings of the Reformation in the Church of *England*, to which we must consider what Answer you return. To his Lordships Question, Why may not a National Council of the Church of *England* do the like? you give this answer, *Truly I know no reason why it may not, provided it be a true National Council and a true Church of* England, (*as those recited were true Churches and Councils*) *and provided also that it do no more.* We are contented to put the issue of this business upon these three things, *viz.* That our *Church* is a *true Church*, That the *power* which reformed it was sufficient for that purpose, and, That no more was done by them than was in their power to do. But for the first you tell us, *That seeing by the Church of* England *he means the present Protestant Church there, you must crave leave of his Lordship to deny his supposition, and tell him the Church of* England *in that sense, signifies no true Church.* Were it not an easie matter to requite you by telling you, It is impossible we should be guilty of *Schism* in any separation from your Communion, because we must crave leave of you to say that the *Church* of *Rome* is no true *Church*; and where there is *Schism* that must be a true *Church* which men are guilty of it in separating from. Not as though I sought only to return a blow on you which I could not defend our *Church* from; but to let you see, that by whatever way you would prove your *Church* to be *true*, by the same we may prove ours to be so too. If you own and believe the *Christian Doctrine* to be the way to salvation, so do we. If you embrace the ancient *Creeds*, so do we. If you acknowledge the *Scriptures* to be *Gods Word*, so do we. If you join together in participation of the *Sacraments* of *Baptism*, and the *Lords Supper*, so do we. If you have a constant *succession* of *Bishops*, so have we. Name then What it is, which is *Fundamental* to the *Being* of a *Church*, which our *Protestant Church* doth want? You grant the *Church of* England *was a true Church* before the *Reformation*, Wherein was it altered from it self by it, that it ceased to be a true *Church*? Was it, in denying the *Pope*'s *Supremacy* in *Henry the eighth*'s time? That cannot be: for you very remarkably grant afterwards, *That the Bishops, and the King too, left the Pope in possession of all that he could rightly challenge.* (Which is a concession we shall make more use of afterwards.) Surely then this could not unchurch them. Or, Was it the proceedings of the *Reformation* in *Queen Elizabeth*'s time? The *Supremacy* could not be it neither now; for that was asserted under a more mode-

P. 158. n. c.

Ibid.

P. 159.

moderate title in her time, than in her Fathers. Was it the *Uſe* of the *Liturgy* in the *Engliſh tongue?* Surely not; when *Pius the fourth* offered to confirm it, as is credibly reported from *Vincentius Parpalia*, whom that *Pope* imployed on a *Meſſage* to *Queen Elizabeth*, with terms of Accommodation. But, What was it which did unchurch us? Were they the *Articles* of *Religion* agreed on in the *Convocation*, 1562? If they were theſe, Were they either the poſitive or negative Articles? If the poſitive, Were they the aſſerting the Articles contained in the three *Creeds*, the *ſufficiency* of *Scriptures*, the *neceſſity* of *Divine Grace?* or, What elſe? If the negative, Was it the denying *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Unlawfulneſs of Prieſts Marriage*, *Communion in one kind?* or, Which of them elſe was it, which made the *Proteſtant Church* to be no *true Church?* Or, Is it laſtly the aſſerting, *That as*
Art. 19. *the Church of* Jeruſalem, Alexandria, *and* Antioch, *have erred, ſo alſo the Church of* Rome *hath erred, not only in their livings, and manner of Ceremonies, but alſo in matters of Faith?* Is this it which hath done us all the miſchief to unchurch us, *viz.* the denying your *Churches Infallibility?* If this be it, it is our comfort yet, that our *Church* will remain a true *Church*, till yours be proved to be *Infallible*; which I dare ſay, will be long enough. But, as though it were in your abſolute power to *Church* and *unchurch* whom, and when you pleaſe, you offer at no proof at all of this aſſertion, but only very fairly *crave his Lordſhips leave to call the Proteſtant Church no true Church*: Which indeed is a more civil way of begging the Queſtion. And if it will not be granted, you cannot help it; for you have done your utmoſt, in *craving his leave* for it, and you have no more to ſay to it.

§. 13. But, you ſeem to ſay much more to the ſecond, *That the Reformation was not managed by a lawful power, nor carried on in a due manner*; for you offer to prove, that the *National Synod* 1562. *was no lawful Synod*, in theſe words. *For is it not notorious, that that pretended Synod* A. D. 1562. *were all*
P. 168, 169. *manifeſt uſurpers? Is it not manifeſt, that they all by force intruded themſelves, both into the Sees of other lawful Biſhops, and into the cures of other lawful Paſtors, quietly and Canonically poſſeſſed of them before the ſaid intruſion? Can thoſe be accounted a lawful National Council of* England, *or lawfully to repreſent the Engliſh Church, who never had any lawful, that is, Canonical and juſt Vocation, Miſſion, or Juriſdiction given them to, and over the Engliſh Nation?* Two things you object as the great reaſons why thoſe perſons who ſate in the Convocation, *A.* 1562. could make no lawful Synod, and thoſe are *Intruſion*, and want of a lawful *Miſſion*: which ſhall be particularly examined. The firſt charge is of *Intruſion*, which you would ſeem to aggravate by ſeveral circumſtances, *that they intruded themſelves*, and that *by force*; and not ſome, but *all*; and that *into the Sees of other lawful Biſhops, and cures of lawful Paſtors*. But how true theſe circumſtances are, muſt appear by a true account of the matters of fact relating to theſe things in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth*'s Reign. How falſe that is, That *all intruded themſelves*, is notorious to any one who underſtands any thing of thoſe times; For this *Convocation* was held in the fifth year of *Queen Elizabeth*. And in the firſt of her Reign, of 26 Cathedral Churches, there were but fourteen or fifteen Biſhops then living in *England*. For the *Sees* of *Sulisbury* and *Oxford* fell vacant *A.* 1557. and were not ſupplied in the time of *Queen Mary*. *Hereford*, *Briſtow*, *Bangor*, were vacant by the death of the ſeveral *Biſhops* ſome weeks before *Queen Mary*. *Canterbury* by the death of *Cardinal Pool*, the ſame day with the *Queen*. *Norwich* and *Glouceſter* a few weeks after her; and ſo likewiſe *Rocheſter*, *Worceſter*, and S. *Aſaph* became vacant by the voluntary exile of *Pates* and *Goldwell*, the *Biſhops* thereof; ſo that but fifteen *Biſhops* were then living and remaining in *England*. And, Were all thoſe who ſupplied theſe

theſe vacant Sees, *Intruders?* A ſtrange kind of *Intruſion* into dead mens places! So then, this circumſtance is notoriouſly falſe, *That they All by force intruded themſelves into the Sees of other lawful Biſhops.* But let us ſee, Whether the other are more juſtly charged with a forcible Intruſion into the *Sees* of the other *Biſhops.* For which we muſt conſider what the *proceedings* were in reference to them: It appears then, that in the firſt year of the *Queen*, the Oath of *Supremacy*, formed and enjoyned in the time of *Henry* 8. was in the firſt *Parliament* of *Queen Elizabeth* revived for the better ſecuring the *Queen* of the *Fidelity* of her ſubjects; but yet it was ſo revived, that ſeveral conſiderable paſſages in the Act concerning it, were upon mature deliberation mitigated, both as to the *Queens* title which was not *Supreme Head*, but Supreme Governour; a title which *Queen Mary* had uſed before, as appears by an Act paſſed in the third Seſſion of Parliament in her time: and likewiſe as to the penalty; for, whereas the *Stat.* 28 *Hen.* 8. *c.* 10. was ſo very ſevere, *That whoſoever did extol the authority of the Biſhop of* Rome, *was, for the firſt offence, within the compaſs of a* Præmunire, *and for refuſing to take the Oath, was guilty of Treaſon*; it paſſed now in *Queen Elizabeth*'s time, only with this penalty, *That ſuch who refuſed it, ſhould be excluded ſuch places of honour and profit, as they held in the Church or Common-wealth; and that ſuch as ſhould maintain or defend the authority, prehemínence, power, or juriſdiction, Spiritual or Eccleſiaſtical, of any foreign Prince, Prelate, Perſon, State, or Potentate whatſoever, ſhould be three times convicted before he ſuffered the pains of death.* Upon the expiring of the *Parliament*, *Commiſſioners* were appointed to require the *Biſhops* to take the *Oath* of *Supremacy*, according to the *Law* made to that purpoſe, which being tendred to them, they all (*Kitchin* of *Landaffe* only excepted) unanimouſly refuſed it, although they had taken it before as *Prieſts* or *Biſhops*, in the Reign of *Henry* 8. or *Edward* 6. But whether by ſome ſecret intimations from *Rome*, or their own obſtinacy, they were reſolved rather to undergo the penalty of the *Law*, than to take it now; and accordingly before the end of that year they were deprived of their *Biſhopricks.* So that the Queſtion about the *Intruſion* of thoſe *Biſhops*, who came into their *Sees*, depends upon the *legality* of the *deprivation* of theſe. And certainly, whoſoever conſiders their former carriage towards the *Queen*, in refuſing to aſſiſt at her *Coronation*, and ſome of them threatning to excommunicate her inſtead of diſputing at *Weſtminſter*, as they had ſolemnly engaged to do, joyned with this contumacy in refuſing the *Oath*, will find that theſe perſons did not unjuſtly ſuffer this *deprivation.* For which I need not run out into the *Princes* power over *Eccleſiaſtical perſons*; for you have given a ſufficient reaſon for it your ſelf in that acknowledgement of yours, *That the Biſhops, and the King too* (meaning *King Henry*) *left the Pope in poſſeſſion of all he could rightly challenge.* If this be true, that notwithſtanding the *Stat.* 28 *Hen.* 8. notwithſtanding the Oath of *Supremacy* then taken, the *Pope* might injoy all that belonged to him of *Divine Right*, he might then do the ſame, notwithſtanding this Oath in *Queen Elizabeth*'s time, which was only reviving the former with ſome mitigation; and what could it be then elſe but obſtinacy and contumacy in them to refuſe it? And therefore the plea which you make for thoſe whom you call the *Henry-Biſhops*, will ſufficiently condemn theſe preſent *Biſhops*, whom we now ſpeak of. For if thoſe *Biſhops* only renounced the *Popes Canonical and acquired Juriſdiction here in* England, as you ſay, *i. e. that Authority and Juriſdiction in Eccleſiaſtical matters, which the Pope exerciſed here by virtue of the Canons, Preſcription, and other titles of humane right, and gave it to the King; yet they never renounced or deprived him of that part of his authority, which is far more intrinſecal to his*

White and *nation.*

office, and of Divine Right; they never denied the Popes Soveraign Power to teach the Universal Church, and determine all Controversies of Faith whatsoever in a General Council. If these things, I say, be true, which you confidently assert, the more inexcusable were these *Bishops* for refusing that Oath of *Supremacy* which they had not only taken in *King Henry*'s time, but which, by your own confession, takes away nothing of the *Pope's Authority, in relation to the whole Catholick Church.* And by this means their obstinacy appeared so great, as might justly deserve a deprivation. It being certainly in the *Power* of the *King* and *Bishops* to assert their own rights, in opposition to any *Canons* or *Prescriptions* whatsoever of meerly humane right. So that by your own confession, the more excusable the *Henry-Bishops* were, as you call them, the less excusable the *Mary-Bishops* were (as, to follow you, we must call them) in refusing the Oath of *Supremacy*, when tendred to them. Was it lawful then in *King Henry*'s time, to take this *Oath* or not? If not, then *King Henry*'s *Bishops* are infinitely to blame for taking it, and you for defending them: If it was lawful then, why not in *Queen Elizabeth*'s time? Had she not as much reason to impose it as her *Father?* Had she not as much power to do it? When one of the chief refusers, *Heath, Arch-Bishop* of *York*, and then *L. Chancellour* of *England*, did, upon the first notice of the death of *Queen Mary*, declare to the House of *Commons*, *That the succession of the Crown did of right belong to the Princess* Elizabeth, *whose title they conceived to be free from all legal Questions*; this could be then no plea at all for them. So that if any persons through the greatest obstinacy, might be deprived by a *Prince* of their *Ecclesiastical* preferments, these might; and when you can prove, that in no case a *Prince* hath power to deprive *Ecclesiastical persons*, you will say more to your purpose than yet you have done. But till you have done that, it remains clear, that these Bishops were justly deprived; and if so, What was to be done with their vacant *Sees?* Must they be kept vacant still? or such be put into them who were guilty of the same fault with themselves, in refusing the *Oath*, when tendred to them? If not such, then it was necessary that other fit persons should be legally consecrated and invested in them: And so they were, the places being supplied by worthy persons; the *Arch-Bishop* of *Canterbury* being consecrated by a Canonical number of *Edward-Bishops*, and the rest duly consecrated by other hands. And for all this, *Must all these persons be intruders, and intrude themselves by force, and that into the places of other lawful Bishops?* When so many *Sees* were actually vacant, and the rest by due form of *Law*, into which other *Bishops* were elected, and legally consecrated, notwithstanding the putid *Fable* of the *Nags-Head* ordination, which hath so often and so evidently been disproved, that I am glad to find you have so much modesty, as not to mention it. These *Bishops* being thus legally invested in their places, To whom did the care and *Government* of the *English Church* belong? to *these*, or to *those* who were justly deprived? If to *these*, Were not they then the due representatives of the *English Church* in a *National Synod*, who with those of the lower *House* of *Convocation*, make up a true *National Council?* And if so, it belonged to them as such, to consider what appertained to the *Faith* and *Government* of the *Church* of *England*. For they undertook not to prescribe to the whole world, that they leave to the *Bishop* and *Church* of *Rome* (not as legally belonging to them, but arrogantly usurped by them) but to draw up *Articles of Religion*, which should be owned by all such who enjoyed any place of *Trust* in the *Church* of *England*. So that in all this they were neither *intruders*, neither did they act any thing beyond their *place* and *authority*. But you would seem to quarrel *with their Vocation, Mission, and Jurisdiction, as though it*

were

were not lawful, i. e. *Canonical and Juſt*; all theſe are your own words, and they are but words; for not one ſyllable like a proof is ſuggeſted. I tell you then (not to ſpend time in a needleſs vindication of the Vocation of the *Biſhops* and *Paſtors* of the *Church* of *England*, when you give us no reaſon to queſtion it) that by the ſame arguments that you can prove that you have any lawful *Biſhops* and *Paſtors* in your *Church*, it will appear that we have too. And that our Vocation and Miſſion is far more conſonant to the *Apoſtolical* and *Primitive Church* than yours is.

But, the main quarrel is ſtill behind, which is, that *Suppoſing they had been true Biſhops, and Paſtors of the Engliſh Church, and their Aſſembly a lawful National Council, yet*, you ſay, *They were ſo far from doing the like (that other Provincial Councils had done) that they acted directly contrary to them, which charge lies in theſe things.* 1. *Condemning points of Faith that had been generally believed and practiſed in the Church before them.* This you know we deny, and you barely affirm it, and I have ſhewed ſome reaſon of our denial already, and ſhall do more when we come to particulars. 2. *In contradicting the Doctrine of the* Roman *Church:* A great Hereſie indeed, but never yet condemned in any *General Council.* 3. *In convening againſt the expreſs Will of the Church of* Rome: We ſhall then think that a fault, when you prove it belongs to that only, to ſummon all Councils, *General*, *National*, and *Provincial.* 4. *In denying the Popes Authority, or attempting to deprive him of it:* if you ſpeak of his *uſurped Authority*, you muſt prove it a fault to deprive him of it, *i. e.* to withdraw our ſelves from obedience to it, for that is all the deprivation can be here underſtood. If you mean *Juſt Authority*, ſhew wherein it lies, whence he had it, by what means he came into it in the *Church* of *England*; and if you can make it appear that he had a juſt claim, it will be eaſie proving them guilty of a fault who diſowned it. But, Whether it were a *fault* in them or no, I am ſure it is *one* in you, to lay ſuch things, and ſo many to our *charge*, and not offering to give evidence for one of them. But I muſt conſider the Infallibility of your *Church* lies in *dictating*, and not *proving*. Thus then, for any thing which you ſo much as ſeem to ſay to the contrary, the proceedings of the *Reformation* were very regular and juſt, being built on ſufficient grounds, managed in a legal manner, and carried on with due moderation. Which are the higheſt commendations can be given to a work of *Reformation*; and do with the greateſt right belong to the *Church* of *England*, of any *Church* in the Chriſtian world. There remains nothing now, which you object againſt our *Reformation*, but ſome faults of the *Reformers*; as to which his Lordſhip had already ſaid, *If any ſuch be found, they are the crimes of the perſons, and not of the Reformation, and they are long ſince gone to God to anſwer it, to whom I leave them.* Which Anſwer ſo full of juſtice and modeſty, one would have thought, ſhould have been ſufficient for any reaſonable man; but you are not ſatisfied with it. *For you will have thoſe faults to come from the principles of the Reformation, and that they did not belong to the perſons of the Reformers, but are entailed on their Succeſſors.* But a ſhort Anſwer will ſuffice for both theſe: ſhew us, What avowed principles of the *Church* of *England* tend to any real *Sacriledge*, before you charge any thing of that nature, as flowing from the *Maxims* of the *Reformation.* And if you can prove the *Succeſſors* of the *Reformers* to continue in any *Sacrilegious Actions*, let thoſe plead for them who will, I ſhall not; but leave them, as his Lordſhip did, *to anſwer ſuch things to God.*

§. 14. P. 156.

P. 170.

As to the *Memorandum*, which his Lordſhip concludes this diſcourſe with, *That he ſpake at that time of the* General Church, *as it was for the moſt part forced under the Government of the* Roman *See: not doubting, but that as the Univerſal Catholick Church would have reformed her ſelf, had ſhe been in*

P. 155. n. 6.

all parts freed of the Roman *Yoke*; *ſo, while ſhe was for the moſt in theſe Weſtern parts under that Yoke, the Church of* Rome *was, if not the only, yet the chief hinderance of Reformation:* You anſwer with ſome ſtomach; *By what force I pray? Is it poſſible? or, Can it enter into the judgement of any reaſonable man, that a ſingle Biſhop, of no very large Dioceſe, ſhould be able by force, to bring into ſubjection ſo many large Provinces of Chriſtendom, as confeſſedly did acknowledge the Popes Power, when the pretended Reformation began?* But, What reaſonable man can imagine, that a *ſingle Biſhop* indeed of no very large *Dioceſe* (if kept within his bounds) ſhould, in progreſs of time, extend his *power* ſo far as the *Pope* did, but by one of theſe two means, *force*, or *fraud?* And ſince you ſeem to be ſo much diſpleaſed at the *former*, I pray take the *latter*; or rather, the conjunction of both together. For that there was *force* uſed, appears by the manifold reſiſtance which was made to the encroachments of the *Popes* power; and the ſad *complaints* of the *uſurpations* and *abuſes* which were in it; and theſe abundantly delivered *by Claſſical Authors of both the preſent and precedent times:* and (to uſe more of your own words) *all Eccleſiaſtical Monuments are full of them*; ſo that this is *no falſe calumny, or bitter Paſquil* (as you call it) but a very plain and evident truth. But that there was likewiſe a great deal of art, ſubtilty and fraud uſed in the getting, keeping, and managing the *Popes* power, he hath but a ſmall *meaſure* of *wit* who doth not *underſtand*, and they as little of *honeſty*, who dare not confeſs it.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the *Roman* Churches Authority.

The Queſtion concerning the Church of Rome*'s Authority entred upon. How far our Church, in reforming her ſelf, condemns the Church of* Rome. *The Pope's equality with other Patriarchs, aſſerted. The Arabick Canons of the Nicene Council proved to be ſuppoſititious. The Polity of the Ancient Church diſcovered from the ſixth Canon of the Council of* Nice. *The Rights of Primates and Metropolitans ſetled by it. The ſuitableneſs of the Eccleſiaſtical, to the Civil Government. That the Biſhop of* Rome *had then a limited Juriſdiction within the ſuburbicary Churches; as Primate of the* Roman *Dioceſe. Of the* Cyprian *Priviledge; that it was not peculiar, but common to all Primates of Dioceſes. Of the Pope's Primacy according to the Canons; how far pertinent to our diſpute. How far the Pope's Confirmation requiſite to new elected Patriarchs. Of the Synodical and Communicatory Letters. The teſtimonies of* Petrus de Marcâ *concerning the Pope's Power of confirming and depoſing Biſhops. The Inſtances brought for it, conſidered. The caſe of* Athanaſius *being reſtored by* Julius, *truly ſtated. The proceedings of* Conſtantine *in the caſe of the Donatiſts cleared, and the evidence thence againſt the Pope's Supremacy. Of the Appeals of Biſhops to* Rome, *how far allowed by the Canons of the Church. The great caſe of Appeals between the* Roman *and* African *Biſhops diſcuſſed. That the Appeals of Biſhops were prohibited, as well as thoſe of the inferiour Clergy.* T. C.*'s fraud in citing the Epiſtle of the* African *Biſhops, for acknowledging Appeals to* Rome. *The contrary manifeſted from the ſame Epiſtle to* Boniface, *and the other to* Cœleſtine. *The exemption of the Ancient Britannick Church from any ſubjection to the See of* Rome, *aſſerted. The caſe of* Wilfrids *Appeal anſwered. The Primacy of* England *not derived from* Gregory*'s Grant to* Auguſtin *the Monk. The Ancient Primacy of the Britannick Church not loſt upon the Saxon Converſion. Of the ſtate of the* African *Churches, after their denying Appeals to* Rome. *The riſe of the Pope's Greatneſs under Chriſtian Emperors. Of the Decree of the Sardican Synod, in caſe of Appeals: Whether ever received by the Church: No evidence thence of the Pope's Supremacy.* Zoſimus *his forgery in ſending the Sardican Canons inſtead of the Nicene. The weakneſs of the pleas for it, manifeſted.*

THat which now remains to be diſcuſſed in the *Queſtion* of *Schiſm*, is, concerning the Authority of the *Church* and *Biſhop* of *Rome*, Whether that be ſo large and extenſive, as to bind us to an univerſal ſubmiſſion, ſo that by renouncing of it, we violate the *Unity* of the *Church*, and are thereby guilty of *Schiſm*? But, before we come to a particular diſcuſſion of that, we muſt caſt our eyes back on the precedent Chapter, in which the title promiſeth us, *That Proteſtants ſhould be further convinced of Schiſm*; but upon examination of it, there appears not ſo much as the ſhadow of any new matter, but it wholly depends upon principles already refuted, and ſo contains a bare repetition of what hath been abundantly anſwered in the firſt part. So your firſt Section hath no more of ſtrength, than what lyes in your *Churches Infallibility*: For, when you would plead, *That though the Church of* Rome *be the accuſed party, yet ſhe may judge in her own cauſe*; you do it upon this ground, *That you had already proved the* Roman *Church to be infallible, and therefore your Church might as well condemn her accuſers, as the Apoſtles theirs; and that Proteſtants not pretending Infallibility, cannot rationally be permitted to be Accuſers and Witneſſes againſt the* §. 1. Chap. 14. P. 171, 172.

the Roman *Church.* Now, What doth all this come to, in caſe your *Church* be not infallible, as we have evidently proved ſhe is not, in the *firſt part*; and that ſhe is ſo far from it, that ſhe hath moſt groſly erred, as we ſhall prove in the *third part?* Your ſecond Section ſuppoſes the matter of fact
P. 173. evident, *That Proteſtants did contradict the publick Doctrine and belief of all Chriſtians generally throughout the world*, which we have lately proved to be an egregious falſity, and ſhall do more afterwards. The cauſe of the *Separatiſts*, and the *Church* of *England*, is vaſtly different, Whether we look on the authority, cauſe, or manner of their proceedings; and in your other Inſtances you ſtill beg the Queſtion, *That your Church is our Mother-Church, and therefore we are bound to ſubmit to her judgement, though ſhe be the accuſed party.* But as to this whole buſineſs of *Quo Judice*, nothing can be ſpoken
P. 157. with more ſolidity and ſatisfaction, than what his Lordſhip ſaith. *If it be a cauſe common to both, as certain it is here (between the Proteſtant and* Roman *Church) then neither part alone may be Judge; if neither alone may judge, then either they muſt be judged by a third, which ſtands indifferent to both, and that is the Scripture: or if there be a jealouſie, or a doubt of the ſenſe of the Scripture, they muſt either both repair to the Expoſition of the Primitive Church, and ſubmit to that; or both call and ſubmit to a General Council, which ſhall be lawfully called, and fairly and freely held with indifferency to all parties; and that muſt judge the Difference according to Scripture; which muſt be their Rule as well as private mens.* When you either attempt to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of this, or ſubſtitute any thing more reaſonable inſtead of it, you may expect a further Anſwer to the Queſtion, *Quo Judice?* as far as it concerns
ad p. 181. the difference between your Church, and ours. The remainder of this *whole Chapter*, is only a repetition of ſomewhat concerning *Fundamentals*, and a further expatiating in words, without the addition of any more ſtrength from reaſon or authority *upon the Churches Infallibility being proved from Scripture*; which having been throughly conſidered already, and an account given, not only of the meaning of thoſe places (one excepted, which we ſhall meet with again) but of the reaſon, Why the ſenſe of them as to *Infallibility* ſhould be reſtrained to the *Apoſtles*, I find no ſufficient motive inducing me to follow you, in diſtruſting the Readers memory, and treſpaſſing on his patience, ſo much as to inculcate the ſame things over and over, as you do. Paſſing by therefore the things already handled, and leaving the reſt (if any ſuch thing appear) to a more convenient place, where theſe very places of Scripture are again brought upon the ſtage in the Queſtions of the *Pope's Authority* and *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, I come to your following *Chapter*, in which you enter upon the *Vindication* of the *Roman Churches Authority.*

§. 2. 2. That which his Lordſhip hath long inſiſted on, and evidently proved, is, *The Right which particular Churches have to reform themſelves, when the General Church cannot for impediments, or will not for negligence do it.* And your Anſwers to his proofs have had their weakneſs ſufficiently laid open; the only thing here objected further, is, *Whether in ſo doing particular Churches do not condemn others of Errors in Faith?* To which his
P. 165. Lordſhip anſwers, *That to reform themſelves, and to condemn others, are two different works, unleſs it fall out ſo, that by reforming themſelves, they do by conſequence condemn any other, that is guilty in that point, in which they reform themſelves; and ſo far to judge and condemn others, is not only lawfull but neceſſary. A man that lives Religiouſly doth not by and by ſit in judgement, and condemn with his mouth all prophane livers: but yet while he is ſilent, his very life condemns them.* To what end his Lordſhip produceth this Inſtance, any one may eaſily underſtand; but you abuſe it, as though his Lordſhip had ſaid, *That Proteſtants only by their Religious lives do con-*

demn

demn your Church; and upon this run out into a ſtrange declamation about *Who the men are that live ſo Religiouſly? They who to propagate the Goſpel the better marry wives contrary to the Canons and bring Scripture for it?* Yes ſurely, much more than they who to propagate your *Church*, enjoy *Concubines*; for which if they can bring ſome *Canons* of your *Church*, I am ſure they can bring no *Scripture* for it. *They who pull down Monaſteries both of Religious men and women?* I ſee, you are ſtill as loth to part them, as they are to be parted themſelves; but if all their *lives* be no more Religious than the moſt of them have been; the pulling of them down might be a greater act of *Religion* than living in them. *They who caſt Altars to the ground?* More certainly than they who worſhipped them. *They who partly baniſh Prieſts, and partly put them to death?* Or they who commit treaſons and do things worthy of death? But you are doubtleſs very Religious and tender-hearted men, whoſe Conſciences would never ſuffer you to baniſh or put any to death for the ſake of *Religion*; no not in Queen *Maries* time here in *England! They who deface the very Tombs of Saints, and will not permit them to reſt even when they are dead?* Or they who profeſs to worſhip dead Saints, and martyr living ones with Fire and Faggot? If this be your *religious living*, none who know what Religion means will be much taken with it. I ſhall eaſily grant that *you ſtick cloſe to the Pope*, but are therein far enough from the Doctrine or life of S. *Peter*. If any of you *have endured Sequeſtrations, Impriſonments, Death it ſelf*, I am ſure it was not for any good you did; not for the *Catholick Faith*, but if you will, for ſome *Catholick Treaſons*, ſuch as would have enwrapt a *whole Nation* in miſery. If this be *your ſuffering perſecution for righteouſneſs ſake*, you will have little cauſe to rejoice in your Fellow-ſufferers. But if you had not a mind to calumniate us, and provoke us to ſpeak ſad truths of you, all this might have been ſpared; for his Lordſhip only choſe this *Inſtance*, to ſhew that a Church or perſon may be condemned *conſequentially*, which was not *intentionally*. But you ſay, *Our Church hath formally condemned yours, by publick and ſolemn cenſures in the* 39 *Articles*. Doth his Lordſhip deny that our *Church* in order to our own reformation hath condemned many *things* which your *Church* holds? No, but that our *Churches* main intention was to reform it ſelf; but, conſidering the corruption and degeneracy of your *Church*, ſhe could not do it, without conſequentially condemning yours: and, that ſhe did juſtly in ſo doing, we are ready on all occaſions to juſtifie.

P. 182. n. 1.

But his Lordſhip asks, *If one particular Church may not judge or condemn another, What muſt then be done where particulars need reformation?* To which his Adverſary gives a plain Anſwer, *That particular Churches muſt in that caſe* (*as* Irenæus *intimateth*) *have recourſe to the Church of* Rome, *which hath more powerful principality; and to her Biſhop, who is the chief Paſtor of the whole Church, as being S.* Peters *Succeſſor*, &c. This is the riſe and occaſion of the preſent Controverſie. To this his Lordſhip Anſwers, *That it is moſt true indeed; the Church of* Rome *hath had, and hath yet, more powerful Principality, than any other particular Church. But ſhe hath not this power from Chriſt. The* Roman *Patriarch by Eccleſiaſtical conſtitutions might perhaps have a Primacy of order: but for principality of power, the Patriarchs were as even, as equal, as the Apoſtles were before them. The truth is, this more powerful Principality the* Roman *Biſhops got under the Emperours, after they became Chriſtian; and they uſed the matter ſo, that they grew big enough to oppoſe, nay to depoſe the Emperors, by the ſame power which they had given them. And after this, other particular Churches, eſpecially here in the Weſt, ſubmitted themſelves to them for Succour and Protections ſake. And this was one main cauſe that ſwell'd* Rome *into this more powerful Principality, and not any right given by Chriſt to make that Prelate, Paſtor of the whole Church.*

§. 3. P. 167.

P. 183. *Church.* To this you Anſwer, *That to ſay that the* Roman *Churches Principality is not from Chriſt, is contrary to St.* Auſtin *and the whole* Milevitan *Council, who in their Epiſtle to* Innocent *the firſt profeſs that the Popes Authority is grounded upon Scripture, and conſequently proceeds from Chriſt.* But whoever ſeriouſly reads and throughly conſiders that Epiſtle, will find no ſuch thing as that you aim at there. For the ſcope of the Epiſtle is to perſwade *Pope Innocent* to appear againſt *Cæleſtius* and *Pelagius*; to that end they give firſt an account of their Doctrine, ſhewing how pernicious and contrary to *Scripture* it was; after which they tell him that *Pelagius* being at *Jeruſalem* was like to do a great deal of miſchief there, but that many of the *Brethren* oppoſed him, and eſpecially St. *Hierom.* *But we*, ſay they, *do ſuppoſe that through the mercy of our Lord Chriſt aſſiſting you, thoſe which hold ſuch perverſe and pernicious principles may more eaſily yield by your Authority drawn out of Scripture.* Where they do not in the leaſt dream of his *Authority* as *Univerſal Paſtor being grounded on Scripture*, but of his appearing againſt the *Pelagians* with his Authority drawn out of *Scripture*, that is, to that Authority which he had in the *Church*, by the reputation of the *Roman See*, the *Authority* of the *Scripture* being added, which was ſo clear againſt the *Pelagians*, or both theſe going together were the moſt probable way to ſuppreſs their Doctrine. And it hath been ſufficiently proved by others, by very many inſtances of the Writers about that Age, that *Authoritas* was no more than *Reſcriptum*; as particularly appears by many paſſages in *Leo*'s Epiſtles, in which ſenſe no more is expreſſed by this, than that by the *Pope*'s Anſwer to the *Council* drawn out of the *Authority of Scripture*, the *Pelagians* might more probably be ſuppreſſed. But what is this to an *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* given by *Chriſt* to him; any otherwiſe than to thoſe who ſat in any other *Apoſtolical Sees?*

Arbitramur — adjuvante miſericordiâ Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti — Authoritati Sanctitatis tuæ de ſanctarum Scripturarum Authoritate depromptæ facilius eos qui tam perverſa & pernicioſa ſentiunt, eſſe ceſſuros. Aug. ep. 92.

But your great quarrel is againſt his Lordſhip, for making all the Patriarchs even and equal, as to *Principality of Power*: and when he ſaith, *Equal as the Apoſtles were*, you ſay, *that is æquivocal; for though the Apoſtles had equal juriſdiction over the whole Church, yet St.* Peter *alone had juriſdiction over the Apoſtles*; but this is neither proved from *John* 21. nor is it at all clear in *Antiquity* as will appear when we come to that Subject.

§. 4. But this aſſertion of the *equality of Patriarchs* is ſo deſtructive to your pretenſions in behalf of the *Church of Rome*, that you ſet your ſelf more particularly to diſprove it; which you offer to do by two things. 1. *By* P. 184. *a Canon of the* Nicene *Council.* 2. *By the practice of the ancient Church.* You begin with the firſt of them, and tell us, *That 'tis contrary to the Council of* Nice, *In the third Canon whereof, which concerns the juriſdiction of Patriarchs, the Authority (or Principality if you will) of the Biſhop of* Rome *is made the Pattern, and Model of that Authority and Juriſdiction which Patriarchs were to exerciſe over the Provincial Biſhops. The words of the Canon are theſe.* Sicque præeſt Patriarcha iis omnibus, qui ſub ejus poteſtate ſunt, ſicut ille qui tenet ſedem Romæ, caput eſt & princeps omnium Patriarcharum, *The Patriarch* (ſay they) *is in the ſame manner over all thoſe that are under his Authority, as he who holds the See of* Rome *is head and Prince of the Patriarchs. And in the ſame Canon the Pope is afterwards ſtyled,* Petro ſimilis & Authoritate par, *reſembling St.* Peter *and his equal in Authority.* Theſe are big words indeed and to your purpoſe, if ever any ſuch thing had been decreed by the *Council* of *Nice*; but I ſhall evidently prove that this *Canon* is *ſuppoſititious*, and a notorious piece of *Forgery.* Which forgery is much increaſed by you when you tell us, theſe words are contained in the third *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*: Which in the Greek Editions

Editions of the Canons by *du Tillet*, and the *Codex Canonum* by *Juſtellus*, and all other extant, in the *Latin* verſions of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, and *Iſidore Mercator*, is wholly againſt the συνείσακτοι, *i. e.* ſuch kind of *women* which *Clergy men* took into their houſes, neither as *Wives* or *Concubines*, but under a pretext of *piety*. In the *Arabick Edition* of the *Nicene Canons*, ſet out by *Alphonſius Piſanus*, the third *Canon* is againſt the ordination either of *Neophyti* or *criminal perſons*, and ſo likewiſe in that of *Turrianus*. So that in no Edition, whether *Arabick* or other, is this the third *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*; and therefore you were guilty either of great ignorance and negligence in ſaying ſo, or of notorious fraud and impoſture if you knew it to be otherwiſe, and yet ſaid it that the unwary reader might believe this *Canon* to be within the 20. which are the only genuine *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice*. Indeed ſuch a *Canon* there is in theſe *Arabick Editions*, but it is ſo far from being the third, that in the Editions both of *Piſanus* and *Turrianus* it is the *thirty ninth*, and in it I grant thoſe words are; but yet you will have little reaſon to rejoyce in them, when I have proved, (as I doubt not to do) that this whole *farrago* of *Arabick Canons* is a meer forgery; and that I ſhall prove both from the true number of the *Nicene Canons*, and the incongruity of many things in the *Arabick Canons* with the *State* and *Polity* of the *Church* at that time.

In thoſe Editions ſet out by *Piſanus* and *Turrianus* from the Copy which they ſay was brought by *Baptiſta Romanus* from the *Partriarch* of *Alexandria* there are no fewer than *eighty Canons*; whereas the *Nicene Council* never paſſed above 20. Which if it appear true, that will ſufficiently diſcover the *Forgery* and *Suppoſititiouſneſs* of theſe *Arabick Canons*. Now that there were no more than twenty genuine *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice*, I thus prove, Firſt from *Theodoret*, who after he had given an account of the proceedings in the *Council* againſt the *Arrians*, he ſaith, *That the Fathers met in Council again, and paſſed twenty Canons relating to the Churches Polity*: and *Gelaſius Cyzicenus*, whom *Alphonſus Piſanus* ſet forth with his *Latin verſion*, recounts no more than *twenty Canons*; the ſame number is aſſerted by *Nicephorus Calliſtus*; and we need not trouble our ſelves with reciting the teſtimonies of more *Greek Authors*, ſince *Binius* himſelf confeſſeth that all the *Greeks* ſay, there were no more than *twenty Canons* then determined. But although certainly the *Greeks* were the moſt competent Judges in this caſe, yet the *Latins* themſelves did not allow of more. For although *Ruffinus* makes twenty two, yet that is not by the addition of any more *Canons*, but by ſplitting two into four. And if we believe *Pope Stephen* in *Gratian*, the *Roman Church* did allow of no more than twenty. And in that *Epitome* of the *Canons* which *Pope Hadrian* ſent to *Charles the Great* for the Government of the *Weſtern Churches*, *A. D.* 773. the ſame number of the *Nicene Canons* appears ſtill. And in a *MS.* of *Hincmarus Rhemenſis* againſt *Hincmarus Laudunenſis*, this is not only aſſerted but at large contended for, that there were no more *Canons* determined at *Nice*, than thoſe twenty which we now have, from the teſtimonies of the *Tripartite hiſtory*, *Ruffinus*, the *Carthaginian Council*, the Epiſtles of *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*, and the twelfth action of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. So that if both *Greeks* and *Latins* ſay true, there could be no more

Αὕθις δὲ συνελθόντες εἰς τὸ συνέδριον, περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς πολιτείας νόμους ἔγραψαν εἴκοσι. Theodoret. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 7. ed. Sirmond. 1642.

Ἐξέθεντο δὲ καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς κανόνας εἴκοσιν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Νικαίᾳ. Gelaſ. Acta Concil. Nicen. lib. 2.

Τὸ τελευταῖον καὶ νόμους ἐτέθησιν εἴκοσιν περὶ κανόνας εἰωθὸς ὀνομάζειν. Niceph. Eccleſiaſt. hiſt. l. 8. c. 19.

Quanquam Græci omnes aſſerant et tutantur, Nicæni Concilii Canones viginti tantum fuiſſe, &c. Bin. not. in Concil. Nicæn. p. 366. To. 1. Ruffin. Eccleſiaſt. hiſt. lib. 1. cap. 5.

Viginti tantum capitula Nicænæ Synodi in Sanctâ Romanâ Eccleſiâ haberi. Gratian. diſtinct. 16. c. 20.

Deinde etiam 20. capitulis Nicæni Concilii recitatis, communi decreto ſtatuerunt capitula 27. (ſive 39.) quæ ſubſequuntur. Vid. Juſtell. not. in Cod. Eccleſ. African. p. 14.

Quod non niſi viginti capitula quæ habemus in Nicæno Concilio fuerunt conſtituta. c. 21. apud Juſtell. ibid.

than twenty genuine *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice*; which may be yet further proved by two things, *viz.* the proceedings of the *African Fathers* in the caſe of *Zoſimus* about the *Nicene Canons* and the *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Univerſæ*, both which yield an abundant teſtimony to our purpoſe. If ever there was a juſt occaſion given for an early and exact ſearch into the authentick *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice*, it was certainly in that grand Debate between the *African Fathers* and the *Roman Biſhops* in the caſe of *Appeals*. For *Zoſimus* challenging not only a right of Appeals to himſelf, but a power of diſpatching *Legates* unto the *African Churches* to hear cauſes there and all this by vertue of a *Canon* in the *Nicene Council*, and this being delivered to them in *Council* by *Fauſtinus*, *Philippus*, and *Aſellus* whom *Zoſimus* ſent into *Africa*, to negotiate this affair; no ſooner did they hear this, but they were ſtartled and amazed at it, that ſuch a thing ſhould be challenged by vertue of a *Canon* in the *Council* of *Nice* which they had never heard of before. Upon this they declare themſelves willing to yield to what ſhould appear to be determined by the *Nicene Canons*; thence they propound that a more exact ſearch might be made into the authentical *Copies* of them: for they profeſs no ſuch thing at all to appear, in all the *Greek copies* which they had among them; although *Cæcilianus* the *Biſhop* of *Carthage* were preſent in the *Council* of *Nice* and brought home thoſe Copies which were preſerved in the *Church* of *Africa*. For in all the *ſubſcriptions* of the *Nicene Council*, whether *Arabick* or others, the name of *Cæcilian* appears; now *Cæcilian* was immediate Predeceſſor in *Carthage* to *Aurelius* who preſided in that *Council* wherein theſe things were debated. And there it is expreſly ſaid, There were but twenty *Canons*. But in order to further ſatisfaction, they decree that a meſſage ſhould be ſent on purpoſe to *Conſtantinople*, *Adtioch*, and *Alexandria* to find out the authentick Copies of the *Nicene Canons*, and after a moſt diligent ſearch no more *Canons* could be found than what the *African Fathers* had before. And thence in the Epiſtle of *Anticas* of *Conſtantinople* written to the *Council* of *Carthage*, he acquaints them that he according to their deſire had ſent them the true and compleat *Canons* (ἐν ἐλοκλήρῳ) of the *Nicene Council*. And to the ſame purpoſe *Cyril* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* mentioning their deſires of having ἀληθέστατα ἴσα the *moſt true and authentick copies* out of the *Archives* of that *Church*, ſo he tells them he had ſent (τὰ πιστότατα ἴσα τῆ τ αὐθεντικῆς συνόδε τῆς ἐν τῆ Νικαίνω πόλει) *the moſt faithful copies of the authentick Synod of* Nice. Now if there had been any ground in the world for *Turrianus* his conjecture, that the *Nicene Canons* were tranſlated into *Arabick* by *Alexander* who was preſent at the *Council*, for the Benefit of thoſe in *Pentapolis* or *Ægypt* who only underſtood that language, (and that before the *Nicene Canons* were burnt, of which *Athanaſius* complains); who was more likely to have found out theſe *Arabick Canons* than *Cyril* the *Patriarch of Alexandria* upon this occaſion eſpecially, when the full and authentick Copies were ſo extreamly deſired? And ſince no ſuch thing at all appeared then, upon the moſt diligent inquiry, What can be more evident, than that theſe eighty *Arabick Canons* are the impoſture of ſome latter age? Beſides, if theſe *Canons* had been genuine and authentick, what imaginable reaſon can be given why they were not inſerted in the *Codex Canonum* as the other twenty were? For, as *Jacobus Leſchaſſerius* well obſerves, we are not to imagine that the *Ancient Church* was governed at *Randome* by looſe and diſperſed *Canons*, whereby it had been an eaſie matter to have foiſted in falſe and ſuppoſititious *Canons*; but that there was a certain body and collection of them digeſted into an exact order; ſo that none could add to or take away any thing from it: and whatever *Canons* were not contained in this body had no power or force

Codex Can. Eccleſ. Afric. p. 58.

Codex Canon. p. 363.

Id. p. 360.

Turrian. præf. in Canon. Arab.

Conſultatio de Controverſ. inter Paul. 5. & Irenpub. Venet. apud Goldaſt. Monarch. Rom. 3. p. 444.

force at all in the *Church*. And that there was such a *Codex Canonum*, that learned Person hath abundantly proved from the *Council of Chalcedon*, which hath many passages referring to it; so that there is now no question made, but that which *Justellus* published is the true collection of those *Canons* of the *Universal Church* which were inserted into the *Codex*; in which we find but only the twenty *Canons* of the *Nicene Council*; and that there could possibly be no more, appears by the number of the *Canons* as they are reckoned in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. From whence it follows that only these twenty *Canons* were ever own'd by the *Universal Church*; for had the *Fathers* of the *Church* known of so many other *Canons* of the *Nicene Council*, (as surely at least the *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria* could not be ignorant of them if there had been any such) can we possibly think that those who had so great a *Veneration* for the *Nicene Council*, should have left the far greater part of the *Canons* of it, out of the *Code* of the *Churches Canons*? I am not ignorant of what is objected by *Binius*, *Bellarmin*, and others, to prove that there were more than twenty *Canons* of the Council of *Nice*; but those proofs either depend upon things as *supposititious* as the *Arabick Canons* themselves, such as the Epistles of *Julius* and *Athanasius ad Marcum*; or else they only prove that several other things were determined by the *Nicene Council* as concerning the celebration of *Easter*, *rebaptizing Hereticks*, and such like, which might be by the *Acts* of the *Council* without putting them into the Canons, as *Baronius* confesseth; but there cannot be any evidence brought of any *Canon* which concerned the *Churches Polity* (for about that *Theodoret* and *Nicephorus* tell us the *Canons* were made) which was not among these twenty. So that it appears that these *Arabick Canons* are a meer forgery of later times, there being no evidence at all that they were known to the *Church* in all the time of the four *General Councils*: and therefore *Baronius*, (notwithstanding the pretences of *Pisanus* and *Turrianus* from the *Alexandrian Copy*, and that out of *Marcellus* his *Library*, yet) since these *Canons* were unknown in the Controversie of the *African Church* about the *Nicene Canons*, leaves the *Patronage* of them to such as might be able to defend them. And *Spondanus* in his contraction of him, (though in his marginal note he saith, *Baronius* was sometimes more inclinable to the inlarged number of the *Nicene Canons*) yet he relates it as his positive opinion, that he rejected all but the twenty, whether *Arabick* or other, as spurious and suppositious. You see then what a fair choice you have made of the third *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice* to prove the superiority of the *Pope* over other *Patriarchs* by; when neither is it the third *Canon*, nor any *Canon* at all of the *Council of Nice*, but a spurious figment like those of *Isidore Mercator*, who thought all would pass for gold which made for the Interest of the *Church* of *Rome*.

Quoniam hæc ignorâsse majores visi sunt, quando oborta controversia in Ecclesiâ Africanâ, de iis mentio necessaria incubuisset; hæc libentius alius differenda relinquemus. Baron. ad An. 325. Parag. 108.

Quamobrem quod in epistolâ quâdam Marci nomine 70. recenseantur. —— quodq; Turrianus profiteatur 80. inventos Arabicâ linguâ scriptos, Latinitate se donâsse—quoniam hæc omnia scripta quibus ingens ille numerus Canonum stabilitur, prorsus incertæ vel potius nullius sunt fidei; nec aliquis usquam probatus antiquitatis auctor amplius quam 20. Canones Nicenæ Synodi agnovisse reperiatur, cæteros ab aliis assertos libentius rejicimus. Spondan. Epitom. Baron. ad A. 325. n. 42.

§. 5.

But were there not such a strong and pregnant evidence from authority to make it appear that these *Canons* were *supposititious*, yet the incongruity of them, with the state of the *Church* at that time would abundantly manifest it, if we had time to compare many of those *Canons* with it. But that which is most material to our purpose, concerning *the equality of the Patriarchs*, your following words will put us upon a further enquiry into. *This also*, say you (viz. *That the Pope was head and Prince of all the Patriarchs*) *the practice of the Church shews, which is always the best expositor and assertor of the Canons. For not only the Popes confirmation was required to all new elected Patriarchs, but it belonged likewise to him to depose unworthy*

P. 124.

Nicol. Pap. ep. ad Michael. Imperat.

Zozom. l. 3. c. 7.

ones, and reſtore the unjuſtly depoſed by others. We read of no leſs than eight ſeveral Patriarchs of Conſtantinople *depoſed by the Biſhop of* Rome. Sixtus *the third depoſed alſo* Polycronius *Biſhop of* Hieruſalem, *as his Acts ſet down in the firſt Tome of the Councils teſtifie. On the contrary,* Athanaſius *Patriarch of* Alexandria, *and* Paulus *Biſhop of* Conſtantinople, *were by* Julius *the firſt reſtored to their reſpective Sees having been unjuſtly expelled by Hereticks. The ſame might be ſaid of divers others: over whom the Pope did exerciſe the like authority: which he could never have done, upon any other ground, than that of Divine right, and as being generally acknowledged St.* Peters *Succeſſour in the Government of the whole Church.* Three things I ſhall return you in Anſwer to this Diſcourſe. 1. *That the Practice of the Church doth not ſhew any ſuch inequality as you contend for between the Pope and other Patriarchs:* 2. *That no ſuch practice of the Church can be proved from the inſtances by you brought;* And therefore, laſtly, *It by no means follows that the Pope exerciſed any ſuch authority by Divine right, or was acknowledged to be St.* Peters *Succeſſour in the Government of the whole Church.* I begin with the practice of the ancient *Church*, which is ſo far from being an evidence of ſuch an inequality of *Patriarchs* as that you contend for, that nothing doth more confirm that which his Lordſhip ſaith concerning the *equality* of them than that doth. For which we appeal to that famous teſtimony to this purpoſe in the ſixth *Canon* of the *Nicene Council. Let ancient cuſtomes prevail; according to which, let the Biſhop of* Alexandria *have power over them who are in* Ægypt, Libya, *and* Pentapolis; *becauſe this was likewiſe the cuſtome for the Biſhop of* Rome. *And accordingly in* Antioch *and other Provinces, let the priviledges be preſerved to the Churches.* Which *Canon* is the more remarkable, becauſe it is the *firſt* that ever was made by the *ancient Church* for regulating the *rights* and *priviledges* of *Churches* over each other; which there was like to be now more conteſt about, not only by reaſon of the *Churches* liberty under *Conſtantine*, but becauſe of the new *diſpoſition* of the *Empire* by him, which was made not long before the ſitting of the *Council* of *Nice*. But the particular occaſion of this *Canon* is generally ſuppoſed to be this. *Meletius* an ambitious *Biſhop* in *Egypt*, much about the time that *Arrius* broached his Hereſie at *Alexandria*, takes upon him to ordain *Biſhops* and others in *Ægypt*, without the conſent of the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria*. This caſe being brought before the *Nicene Fathers*, they pronounce theſe ordinations *null*, depoſe *Meletius*, and, to prevent the like practices for the future, do by this *Canon* confirm the ancient *cuſtoms* of that nature in the *Church*; ſo that the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria* ſhould enjoy as full right and power over the Provinces of *Ægypt*, *Libya*, and *Pentapolis*, as the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had over thoſe ſubject to him, as likewiſe *Antioch* and other *Churches* ſhould enjoy their former *priviledges*. Where we plainly ſee that the ground of this extent of power is not attributed to any *Divine right* of the *Biſhop of Rome*, or any other *Metropolitan*, but to the *ancient cuſtome* of the *Church*; whereby it had obtained that ſuch *Churches* that were deduced (as it were ſo many *colonies*) from the *Mother-Church*, ſhould retain ſo much reſpect to and dependence upon her, as not to receive any *Biſhop* into them without the conſent of that *Biſhop* who governed in the *Metropolis*. Which was the prime reaſon of the ſubordination of thoſe leſſer *Churches* to the *Metropolis*: And this cuſtome being drawn down from the firſt plantation of *Churches*, and likewiſe much conducing to the preſerving of *unity* in them, theſe *Nicene Fathers* ſaw *no reaſon* to alter it, but *much* to confirm it. For otherwiſe, there might have been continual bandying and oppoſition of leſſer *Biſhops*, and *Churches* againſt the greater; and therefore the *Diſcipline* and *Unity* of the

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω· τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθες ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Concil. Nicen. Can. 6.

the *Church* did call for this ſubordination; which could not be better determined than by the ancient cuſtome which had obtained in the ſeveral *Churches*. It being found moſt convenient that the *Churches* in their ſubordination ſhould be moſt agreeable to the civil *diſpoſition* of the *Empire*. And therefore for our better underſtanding the force and effect of this *Nicene Canon*, we muſt caſt our eye a little upon the *civil diſpoſition* of the *Roman Empire* by *Conſtantine*, then lately altered from the former diſpoſition of it under *Auguſtus* and *Adrian*. He therefore diſtributed the adminiſtration of the *Government* of the *Roman Empire* under four *Præfecti Prætorio*; but for the more convenient management of it, the whole body of the *Empire* was caſt into ſeveral *Juriſdictions* containing many *Provinces* within them which were in the Law call'd *Dioceſes*; over every one of which there was appointed a *Vicarius*, or *Lieutenant*, to one of the *Præfecti Prætorio*, whoſe reſidence was in the chief City of the *Dioceſe*, where the *Prætorium* was, and juſtice was adminiſtred to all within that *Dioceſe*, and thither *appeals* were made. Under theſe were thoſe *Proconſuls* or *Correctores* who ruled in the particular *Provinces*; and had their reſidence in the *Metropolis* of it, under whom were the particular *Magiſtrates* of every *City*; now according to this diſpoſition of the *Empire*, the *Weſtern* part of it contained in it ſeven of theſe *Dioceſes*, as, under the *Præfectus Prætorio Galliarum*, was the *Dioceſe* of *Gaul*, which contained ſeventeen Provinces; the Dioceſe of *Britain*, which contained five, (afterwards but three in *Conſtantines* time) the Dioceſe of *Spain*, ſeven. Under the *præfectus Prætorio Italiæ*, was the *Dioceſe* of *Africa*, which had ſix Provinces, the *Dioceſe* of *Italy*, whoſe ſeat was *Milan*, 7. the *Dioceſe* of *Rome*, 10. Under the *Præfectus Prætorio Illyrici*, was the *Dioceſe* of *Illyricum*, in which were ſeventeen *Provinces*. In the *Eaſtern* Diviſion, were the *Dioceſe* of *Thrace*, which had ſix Provinces, the *Dioceſe* of *Pontus* 11. and ſo the *Dioceſe* of *Aſia*, the *Oriental* (properly ſo called) wherein *Antioch* was, 15. all which were under the *Præfectus Prætorio Orientis*; the *Ægyptian Dioceſe*, which had ſix *Provinces*, was under the *Præfectus Auguſtalis*; in the time of *Theodoſius* the elder, *Illyricum* was divided into two *Dioceſes*, the *Eaſtern*, whoſe *Metropolis* was *Theſſalonica*, and had eleven *Provinces*, the *Weſtern*, whoſe Metropolis was *Syrmium*, and had ſix *Provinces*. According to this diviſion of the *Empire*, we may better underſtand the Affairs and Government of the *Church*, which was model'd much after the ſame way; unleſs where *Ancient cuſtom*, or the *Emperour's edict*, did cauſe any variation. For as the Cities had their *Biſhops*, ſo the *Provinces* had their *Arch-Biſhops*, and the *Dioceſes* their *Primates*, whoſe Juriſdiction extended as far as the *Dioceſe* did; and as the *Conventus Juridici* were kept in the chief City of the *Dioceſe* for matters of *Civil Judicature*, ſo the chief *Eccleſiaſtical Councils* for the affairs of the *Church*, were to be kept there too; for which there is an expreſs paſſage in the *Codex* of *Theodoſius*, whereby care is taken, *That the ſame courſe ſhould be uſed in Eccleſiaſtical, which was in civil matters; ſo that ſuch things which concerned them ſhould be heard in the Synods of the Dioceſe.* Where the word *Dioceſe* is not uſed in the ſence the *African Fathers* uſed it in, for that which belonged to one *Biſhop* (as it is now uſed) but as it is generally uſed in the *Codex* of *Theodoſius* and *Juſtinian*, and the *Novells* and *Greek Canons*; for that which comprehends in it many *Provinces*, as a *Province* takes in ſeveral *Dioceſes* of particular *Biſhops*.

Codex Theodoſ. de Epiſcop. l. 23. *Qui mos eſt cauſarum civilium, idem in negotiis Eccleſiaſticis obtinendi ſunt, ſi qua ſunt —— ad religionis obſervantiam pertinentia, locis ſuis & à ſuæ diœceſeos Synodis audiantur.*

§. 5. Theſe things being premiſed, we may the better underſtand the ſcope of the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*; in which three things are to our purpoſe conſiderable; 1. That it ſuppoſeth particular bounds and limits ſet to

to the *Juriſdiction* of thoſe who are mentioned in it. 2. That what *Churches* did enjoy *priviledges* before this *Council*, had them confirmed by this *Canon*, as not to be altered. 3. That the *Churches* enjoying theſe *priviledges* were not ſubordinate to each other.

1. That particular *bounds* and *limits* were ſuppoſed to the power of thoſe *Churches* therein mentioned. For, although we grant that this *Canon* doth not fix or determine, What the bounds were of the *Roman Biſhops* power, yet that it doth ſuppoſe that it had its bounds, is apparent from the example being drawn from thence for the *limits* of other *Churches*. For, What an unlikely thing is it, that the *Church* of *Rome* ſhould be made the pattern for aſſigning the *limits* of other *Metropolitan Churches*, if that had not its known *limits* at that time? And, Can any thing be more abſurd or unreaſonable, than the Anſwer which *Bellarmin* give to this place, That the *Biſhop of* Alexandria *ought to govern thoſe Provinces, becauſe the* Roman *Biſhop hath ſo accuſtomed, i.e.* ſaith he, *To let the Alexandrian Biſhop govern them.* Here is an *id eſt* with a witneſs. What will not theſe men break through, that can ſo confidently obtrude ſuch monſtrous interpretations upon the credulous world! Is it poſſible to conceive when the *Canon* makes uſe of the parallel of the *Roman Biſhop*, and makes that the ground *why the Biſhop of* Alexandria *ſhould enjoy full power over thoſe Provinces, becauſe the Biſhop of* Rome *did ſo*; that the meaning ſhould be, *That he gave the Biſhop of* Alexandria *power to govern thoſe Provinces*? They who can believe ſuch things, may eaſily find arguments for the *Pope's unlimited Supremacy* every where. I make no ſcruple to grant what *Bellarmin* contends for, from the Epiſtle of *Nicolaus* 1. That the *Council* did not herein aſſign *limits* to the *Church* of *Rome*, but made that a pattern whereby to order the *Government* of other *Churches*. And from thence it is ſufficiently clear to any reaſonable man, that the *limits* of her Government were, though not aſſigned, yet ſuppoſed by the *Council*. For otherwiſe, How abſurd were it to ſay, *Let the Biſhop of* Alexandria *govern* Ægypt, Libya, *and* Pentapolis, *becauſe the Biſhop of the Church of* Rome *hath no limits at all, but governs the whole Church*? Doth not τῶτο συνηθὲς import ſome parallel cuſtom in the *Church* of *Rome*, and name therefore what that is, ſuppoſing he hath no limits ſet to his *Juriſdiction*? *Yes*, it may be you will reply, *He had limits as a Metropolitan, but not as Head of the Church.* Grant me then, that he had limits as *Metropolitan*, and then prove you, that ever he had any unlimited power acknowledged as *Head of the Church.* Would they ever have made ſuch an inſtance in him, without any diſcrimination of his *ſeveral capacities*, if they had known any other *power* that he had, but only as a *Metropolitan*? Nay, might not the *Biſhops* of *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, be rather ſuppoſed to have the greater *power*, becauſe their *Provinces* were much larger here than his. And although *Bellarmin* uſeth that as his great argument, Why *Ruffinus* his expoſition cannot hold, *Becauſe the Biſhop of* Rome *would have a leſſer Dioceſe aſſigned him, than either the Biſhops of* Antioch, *or* Alexandria; yet when we conſider, What hath been ſaid already of the agreement of the *Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Government*, a ſufficient account may thence be given of it. For as the *Præfectus Auguſtalis* had all the Provinces of *Ægypt* for his *Dioceſe*, ſo had the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria*; and, as the *Lieutenant* of *Antioch* had that which was properly called the *Orient*, containing fifteen *Provinces* under him, ſo had the *Biſhop* of *Antioch*; and by the ſame proportion, the *power* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* did correſpond to the *Dioceſe* of the *Roman Lieutenant*, which was over thoſe ten *Provinces*, which were ſubject to his *Juriſdiction*, as it was diſtinct from the *Dioceſe* of

Quarta igitur & vera expoſitio eſt, Alexandrinum debere gubernare illas provincias, quia Romanus Epiſcopus ita conſuevit, id eſt, quia Romanus Epiſcopus ante omnem Conciliorum definitionem conſuevit permittere Epiſcopo Alexandrino regimen Ægypti, Libyæ & Pentapolis. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 13.

of *Italy*, which was under that *Lieutenant*, whoſe reſidence was at *Milan*. Here we ſee then a parity of reaſon in all of them: and therefore I cannot but think that the true account of the *Suburbicary Churches* in *Ruffinus* his expoſition of this *Canon*, is, that which we have now ſet down, *viz.* thoſe *Churches* which lay within the ten *Provinces* ſubject to the *Roman Lieutenant*. But of them more afterwards. That which I now inſiſt on, is, that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had then a *limited Juriſdiction*, as other *Metropolitans* and *Primats* had. Nay, if we ſhould grant that the *title* produced by *Paſchaſinus* in the *Council* of *Chalcedon* to this *Canon*, were not ſuch a *forgery* as that of *Zoſimus*, yet the moſt that could prove, was only this, That the *Roman Church* had alwayes the *primacy* within her *Dioceſe*, i. e. *all Metropolitical power*; but not that it had an *unlimited primacy* in the whole *Church*, which was a thing none of thoſe *Fathers* who lived in the time of the four *Councils*, did ever acknowledge; but alwayes oppoſed any thing tending to it, as appears by thoſe very proceedings of *Paſchaſinus* at the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and by the *Canons* of that *Council*, and of the *Council* of *Conſtantinople*. And it is a rare Anſwer to ſay, *That thoſe Canons are not allowed by the* Roman *Church*; for by that very Anſwer it appears, that they did oppoſe the *Pope's Supremacy*, or elſe doubtleſs they would have been allowed there, But that the *Pope's Metropolitical Power* was confined within the *Roman Dioceſe*, ſo as not to extend to the *Italick*, we have this pregnant evidence, that it appears by the occaſion of the *Nicene Canon*, that the main Power conteſted for, was that of *Ordination*; and it is evident by *Theodoret* and *Syneſius* his Epiſtles, that the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria* did retain it as his due by virtue of this *Canon*, to ordain the *Biſhops* of *Pentapolis* as well as *Ægypt*. But now the *Biſhop* of *Rome* did not ordain the *Biſhop* of *Milan* who was in the *Italick Dioceſe*; for S. *Ambroſe* was ordained *Biſhop* by a *Synod* of *Italy* at the appointment of the Emperour *Valentinian*, and by an Epiſtle of *Pelagius*. 1. *A. D.* 555. it appears that the *Biſhops* of *Aquileia* and *Milan*, were wont to ordain each other; which, though he would have believed, was only *to ſave charges in going to* Rome; yet as that *learned* and ingenuous perſon *Petrus de Marca* obſerves, *the true reaſon of it, was, becauſe* Milan *was the Head of the Italick Dioceſe, as appears by the Council of* Aquileia, *and therefore the ordination of the Biſhop of* Aquileia, *did of right belong to the Biſhop of* Milan; *and the ordination of the Biſhop of* Milan *did belong to him of* Aquileia, *as the chief Metropolitan of the general Synod of the Italick Dioceſe*. Although afterwards the *Biſhops* of *Rome* got it ſo far into their hands, that their conſent was neceſſary for ſuch an ordination, yet that was only when they began more openly to encroach upon the liberties of other *Churches*. But, as the ſame learned Author goes on, thoſe *Provinces* which lay out of *Italy*, did undoubtedly ordain their own *Metropolitans*, without the authority or conſent of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, which he there largely proves of the *African*, *Spaniſh*, and *French Churches*. It follows then from the ſcope of the *Nicene Canon*, and the practice of the *Church*, that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had a limited Juriſdiction, as the *Biſhops* of *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, and other *Primates* had.

Theodoret. l. 1. c. 9. Syneſ. ep. ad Theophil. Alexand.

Cùm verò hujus inſtituti ratio in eo conſiſtat quòd cum Mediolanum eſſet caput Diœceſeos Italicæ, ut conſtat ex Concilio Aquileienſi, ordinatio Metropolitæ Aquileienſis ad Epiſcopum Mediolanenſem optimo jure pertinebat; Primatis verò Mediolanenſis ordinatio ad Aquileienſem Epiſcopum, quod primus eſſet inter Metropolitanos Synodi Generalis Diœceſeos Italicæ. Petrus de Marcâ de Concord. Sacerdot. & Imp. l. 6. c. 4. ſect. 7.

Ibid. ſect. 8.

§. 6. 2. *That what Churches did enjoy priviledges before had them confirmed by this* Canon, *as not to be altered*. For it makes proviſion againſt any ſuch alteration, by ordaining that the ancient cuſtoms ſhould be in force ſtill. And according y we find it decreed in the *ſecond Canon* of the *Conſtantinopolitan Council*, *That the ſame limits of Dioceſes ſhould be obſerved, which*

which were decreed in the Council of Nice; *and that none ſhould intrude to do any thing in the Dioceſes of others.* And by the earneſt and vehement Epiſtles of *Pope Leo* to *Anatolius*, we ſee the main thing he had to plead againſt the advancement of the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* was, that by this means *the moſt ſacred Decrees of the Council of* Nice *would be violated.* We ſee then, that thoſe priviledges which belonged to *Churches* then, ought ſtill to be inviolably obſerved; ſo that thoſe *Churches* which then had *Primates* and *Metropolitans* of their own, might plead their own right by virtue of the *Nicene Canon.* So we find it decreed in that *Council* of *Epheſus* in the famous caſe of the *Cyprian Biſhops*; for their *Metropolitan* being dead (*Troilus* the *Biſhop* of *Conſtance*) the *Biſhop* of *Antioch* pretended that it belonged to him to ordain their *Metropolitan*, becauſe *Cyprus* was within the civil Juriſdiction of the *Dioceſe* of *Antioch*; upon this the *Cyprian Biſhops* make their complaint to the *General Council* at *Epheſus*, and ground it upon that ancient cuſtom which the *Nicene Canon* inſiſts on, *viz.* that their *Metropolitan* had been exempt from the *Juriſdiction* of the *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, and was ordained by a *Synod* of *Cyprian Biſhops*; which priviledge was not only confirmed to them by the *Epheſine Council*, but a general decree paſſed, *That the rights of every Province ſhould be preſerved whole and inviolate, which it had of old according to ancient cuſtom.* Which was not a decree made meerly in favour of the *Cyprian Biſhops*, but a common aſſerting the *rights* of *Metropolitans*, that they ſhould be held inviolate. Now therefore it appears, that all the *Churches* then were far from being under one of the *three Patriarchs*, of *Rome*, *Antioch*, or *Alexandria*; for, not only the three *Dioceſes* of *Pontus*, *Aſia*, and *Thracia*, were exempt (although afterwards they voluntarily ſubmitted to the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*) but likewiſe all thoſe *Churches* which were in diſtinct *Dioceſes* from theſe, had *Primates* of their own, who were independent upon any other. Upon which account it hath not only been juſtly pleaded in behalf of the *Britannick Churches*, that they are exempt from the Juriſdiction of the *Roman Biſhop*; but it is ingenuouſly confeſſed by *Father* Barns, *That the Britannick Church might plead the Cyprian priviledge, that it was ſubject to no Patriarch. And, although this priviledge was taken away by force and tumult, yet being reſtored by the conſent of the Kingdom, in* Henry 8. *time, and quietly enjoyed ſince, it ought to be retained for peace ſake, without prejudice of Catholiciſm, and the brand of Schiſm.* If ſo, certainly it can be no *Schiſm*, to withdraw from the uſurped Authority of the *Roman Church.* But theſe things have been more largely inſiſted on by others, and therefore I paſs them over.

Council. Epheſ. act. 7. part 2. p. 424.

Ἔδοξε τοίνυν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ σῶζεσθαι ἑκάστῃ ἐπαρχίᾳ, καθὼς καὶ ἀβάτα τὰ αὐτῇ προσόντα δίκαια ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀναθεν καὶ τὸ πάλαι κρατοῦσαν ἔθος. Concil. Epheſ. Can. 8. in edit. vero Binii ante Canones habetur. Tom. 2. Concil. Part. 2. Act. 7. p. 426.

Inſula autem Britanniæ gaviſa eſt olim privilegio Cypriorum ut nullius Patriarchæ legibus ſubderetur. Hoc autem privilegium etſi abolitum olim fuit bellorum tumultibus & vi, tamen cum tempore Henrici 8. totius regni conſenſu fuerit repetitum, & ab eo tempore pacificè præſcriptum: videtur pacis ergò retineri debere, ſine diſpendio Catholiciſmi, & abſq; Schiſmatis ullius notâ. Barns Catholico-Romanus Pacificus MS. ſect. 3.

3. From thence it follows, that there was then an *equality*, not only among the *Patriarchs* (whoſe name came not up till ſome time after the *Council* of *Nice*) but among the ſeveral *Primates* of *Dioceſes*, all enjoying equal power and authority over their reſpective *Dioceſes*, without ſubordination to each other. But here it is vehemently pleaded by ſome, who yet are no *Friends* to the unlimited power of the *Roman Biſhop*, *That it is hardly conceivable, that he ſhould have no other power in the Church, but meerly as Head of the* Roman *Dioceſe, and that it appears by the Acts of the Church he had a regular preheminence above others in ordering the Affairs of the Church.* To which I anſwer, 1. If this be granted, it is nothing at all to that *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* over the *Church*, which our *Adverſaries* contend for, *as due by divine right, and acknowledged to be ſo by conſent of the Church.*

Let

Let the *Biſhop* of *Rome* then quit his former plea, and inſiſt only on this, and we ſhall ſpeedily return an Anſwer, and ſhew, How far this *Canonical Primacy* did extend. But, as long as he challengeth a *Supremacy* upon other grounds, he forfeits this *right*, whatever it is, which comes by the *Canons* of the *Church*. 2. What meerly comes by the *Canons* of the *Church*, cannot bind the *Church* to an abſolute ſubmiſſion, in caſe that authority be abuſed to the *Churches* apparent prejudice. For the *Church* can never give away her *Power* to ſecure her ſelf againſt whatever incroachments tend to the *injury* of it. This power then may be reſcinded by the parts of the *Church*, when it tends to the miſchief of it. 3. This *Canonical preheminence* is not the main thing we diſpute with the *Church* of *Rome*; let her reform her ſelf from all thoſe errours and corruptions which are in her communion, and reduce the *Church* to the primitive purity and ſimplicity of Faith and Worſhip, and then ſee if we will quarrel with the *Primacy* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, according to the *Canons*, or any regular preheminence in him meerly in order to the *Churches* Peace and Unity. But this is not the caſe between us and them, they challenge an *unlimited power*, and that by *divine right*, and nothing elſe will ſatisfie them but this, although there be neither any ground in *Scripture* for it, nor any evidence of it in the *practice* of the *Ancient Church*.

But however, we muſt ſee, what you produce for it; Firſt, you ſay, *The Pope's Confirmation was required to all new elected Patriarchs.* To that I ſhall return the full and ſatisfactory Anſwer of the late renowned *Arch-biſhop* of *Paris*, *Petrus de Marcâ*, where he propounds this as an Objection out of *Baronius*, and thus ſolves it; *That the confirmation of Patriarchs by the Biſhop of* Rome, *was no token of Juriſdiction, but only of receiving into Communion, and a teſtimony of his conſent to the conſecration already performed.* And this was no more than was done by other *Biſhops* in reference to the *Biſhop* of *Rome* himſelf; for S. *Cyprian* writing to *Antonianus* about the election of *Cornelius* ſaith, *That he was not only choſen by the ſuffrage of the people, and teſtimony of the Clergy; but that his election was confirmed by all their conſent.* May not you then as well ſay, That the *Biſhop* of *Carthage* had power over the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, becauſe his ordination was confirmed by him, and other *African Biſhops*. But any one who had underſtood better than you ſeem to do, the proceedings of the *Church* in thoſe ages, would never have made this an argument of the *Pope's* Authority over other *Patriarchs*, ſince, as the ſame *Petrus de Marcâ* obſerves, *It was the cuſtom in thoſe times, that not only the Patriarchs but the* Roman *Biſhop himſelf upon their election, were wont to ſend abroad Letters, teſtifying their ordination, to which was added a profeſſion of Faith contained in their Synodical Epiſtles.* Upon the receipt of which, *Communicatory Letters* were ſent to the perſon newly ordained, to teſtifie their *Communion* with him, in caſe there were no juſt impediment produced. So that this was only a matter of *Fraternal Communion*, and importing nothing at all of *Juriſdiction*; but the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, who were ready to make uſe of all occaſions to advance their own *Grandeur*, did in time make uſe of this for quite other ends, than it was primarily intended; for, in caſe of any ſuſpicions and jealouſies of any thing that might tend to the diſ-ſervice of their *See*, they would then deny their *Communicatory Letters* as *Simplicius* did in the caſe of the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*. And in that Confirma-

Quod ad Patriarchas attinet, reſponderi poteſt, Confirmationem illam non eſſe ſignum juriſdictionis, ſed tantum ſuſceptionis in communionem, & teſtimonium quo conſtabat, ſummum Pontificem conſentire conſecrationi jam peractæ. Petrus de Marcâ de Concord. c. Sacerdot. & Imper. l. 6. c. 5. ſect. 2.

Factus eſt autem Cornelius Epiſcopus de Dei & Chriſti ejus judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium teſtimonio, de plebis quæ tunc affuit ſuffragio, & de Sacerdotum antiquorum & bonorum virorum Collegio — Cum Fabiani locus vacaret, quo occupato de Dei voluntate & omnium noſtrûm conſentione Firmato. Cyprian. ep. 52. p. 75. ed. Rigalt.

Quippe uſu receptum erat per illas tempeſtates, ut Patriarchæ, & ipſe etiam Romanus Pontifex recens electus, literas de ſuâ ordinatione mitterent; quibus addebatur profeſſio fidei in Synodicis eorum Epiſtolis conſcripta. Petrus de Marcâ. ib.

tion of *Anatolius* by *Leo* 1. which *Baronius* ſo much inſiſts on, *Leo* himſelf gives a ſufficient account of it, *viz. to manifeſt that there was but one entire Communion among them throughout the world.* So that if the *Pope's* own judgement may be taken, this Confirmation of new elected *Patriarchs* imported nothing of *Juriſdiction*. But, in caſe the *Popes* did deny their *Communicatory Letters*, that did not preſently hinder them from the execution of their office; as appears by the inſtance of *Flavianus*, the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*: for although three *Roman Biſhops* ſucceſſively oppoſed him, *Damaſus*, *Syricius*, and *Anaſtaſius*, and uſed great importunity with the *Emperour*, that he might not continue in his place, yet becauſe the *Churches* of the *Orient*, *Aſia*, *Pontus*, and *Thracia*, did approve of him, and communicate with him, he oppoſed their conſent againſt the *Biſhops* of *Rome*. Upon which, and the *Emperour's* ſevere checking them for their pride and contention, they at laſt promiſed the *Emperour*, that they would lay aſide their enmity, and acknowledge him. So that, notwithſtanding whatever the *Roman Biſhops* could do againſt him, he was acknowledged for a *true Patriarch*, and at laſt their conſent was given only by renewing *Communion* with him; which certainly is far from being an inſtance of the *Pope's power* over the other *Patriarchs*.

ut per totum mundum una nobis ſit unius Communionis integritas, in quâ ſocietatem tuæ dilectionis amplectamur, & geſtorum que ſumpſimus ſeriem, neceſſariis munitam ſubſcriptionibus approbamus. Leo 1. ep. 38.

Theodoret. l. 5. c. 23.

§. 8. P. 184. Whereby we alſo ſee, What little power he had in depoſing them; although you tell us, *That it belonged likewiſe to him to depoſe unworthy ones, and reſtore the unjuſtly depoſed by others.* But, that the power of depoſing *Biſhops* was anciently in *Provincial Councils*, appears ſufficiently by the *fifth Canon* of the *Nicene Council*, and by the practice of the *Church*, both before and after it; and it is acknowledged by *Petrus de Marcâ*, that the *ſole power* of depoſing *Biſhops*, was not in the hands of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, till about eight hundred years ſince; and refutes the *Cardinal Perron* for ſaying otherwiſe; and afterwards largely proves, that the *Supreme authority* of *depoſing Biſhops*, was ſtill in *Provincial Councils*, and that the *Pope* had nothing to do in it, till the decree of the *Sardican Synod*, in the caſe of *Athanaſius*; which yet, he ſaith, did not (as is commonly ſaid) decree *Appeals* to be made to *Rome*, but only gave the *Biſhop* of *Rome* power to *Review* their actions, but ſtill reſerving to *Provincial Councils* that *Authority* which the *Nicene Council* had eſtabliſhed them in. All the power which he then had, was only this, that he might decree that the matters might be handled over again, but not that he had the power himſelf of depoſing or reſtoring *Biſhops*: Which is proved with that clearneſs and evidence by that excellent Author, that I ſhall refer you to him for it: and conſider the inſtances produced by you to the contrary. *We read* (ſay you) *of no leſs than eight ſeveral Patriarchs of* Conſtantinople *depoſed by the Biſhop of* Rome. Surely if you had read this your ſelf, you would have quoted the place, with more care and accuracy than you do: for you give us only a blind citation of an Epiſtle of *Pope Nicolaus*, to the *Emperour Michael*, neither citing the words, nor telling us which it is, when there are ſeveral, and thoſe no very ſhort ones neither. But however, it is well choſen, to have a *Pope's* teſtimony in his own cauſe, and that ſuch a *Pope* who was then in conteſt with the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, and that too ſo long after the encroachments of the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, it being in the *ninth Century*; and yet for all this, this *Pope* doth not ſay thoſe words which you would faſten upon him; that which he ſaith, is, *That none of the Biſhops of* Conſtantinople, *or ſcarce any of them, were ejected without the conſent of the Biſhop of* Rome. And then inſtanceth in *Maximus*, *Neſtorius*, *Acacius*, *Anthimus*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paulus*, *Petrus*; but his deſign in this, is only to ſhew that *Ignatius* the *Patriarch* ought not to have been

De Concord. l. 7. c. 1. ſect. 6.

Aut vinquam omnino, aut certè vix, horum aliquis ſine conſenſu Romani Pontificis reperitur ejectus. Nicol. 1. epiſt. 8. Michael. Imp. Tom. 6. Concil. p. 500.

been depoſed without his conſent. But what is all this to the *Pope's ſole power of depoſing?* when even at that time the *Pope* did not challenge it: But, ſuppoſing the *Popes* had done it before, it doth not follow that it was in their *power* to do it, and that the *Canons* had given them right to do it, but leaſt of all certainly that they had a *Divine right* for it, which never was in the leaſt acknowledged by the *Church* as to a depoſition of *Patriarchs*, which you contend for. But beſides this, you ſay, Sixtus *the third depoſed* Polychronius *Biſhop of* Hieruſalem. Whereas *Sixtus* only ſent eight perſons from a *Synod* at *Rome* to *Hieruſalem*, who when they came there, did not offer to depoſe *Polychronius* by vertue of the *Popes power*; but a *Synod* of ſeventy or more neighbour Biſhops were call'd, by whom he was depoſed; and yet after all this, *Binius* himſelf condemns thoſe *Acts* which report this ſtory, for ſpurious; there being a manifeſt repugnancy in the time of them, and no ſuch perſon as *Polychronius* ever mentioned by the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians* of that time, and other fabulous Narrations inſerted in them. Yet theſe are your goodly proofs of the *Popes* power to depoſe *Patriarchs*. *Tom. 2. Concil. p. 685.*

But we muſt ſee whether you have any better ſucceſs in proving his power to reſtore ſuch as were depoſed; for which you only inſtance in *Athanaſius and Paulus reſtored by Julius*; whoſe caſe muſt be further examined, which, in ſhort, is this: *Athanaſius* being condemned by the *Synods* of *Tyre* and *Antioch*, goes to *Rome*, where he and *Paulus* are received into Communion by *Julius*, who would not accept of the Decree of the *Eaſtern Biſhops* which was ſent after him to *Rome*. For *Pope Julius* did not formally offer to reſtore *Athanaſius* to his *Church*, but only owned and received him into *Communion* as *Biſhop* of *Alexandria*, and that becauſe he looked on the proceedings as unjuſt in his condemnation. And all that *Julius* himſelf pleads for, is, not a power to depoſe or reſtore *Patriarchs* himſelf, but only that ſuch things ought not to have been done without communicating thoſe proceedings to him, which the *Unity* of the *Church* might require. And therefore *Petrus de Marca* ſaith, that *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, and *Perron* are all ſtrangely out in this ſtory, when they would infer, That the cauſes of the *Eaſtern Biſhops* upon appeal were to be judged by the *Biſhop* of *Rome*: whereas all that *Julius* pleads for, is, that ſuch things ſhould not be done by the *Eaſtern Biſhops* alone, which concerned the depoſition of ſo great a perſon in the *Church* as the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, but that there ought to be a *Council* both of the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Biſhops*; on which account afterwards the *Sardican Synod* was called. But when we conſider with what heat and ſtomach this was received by the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, how they abſolutely deny that the *Weſtern Biſhops* had any more to do with their proceedings, than they had with theirs; when they ſay, that the *Pope* by this uſurpation was the cauſe of all the miſchief that followed, we ſee what an excellent inſtance you have made choice of, to prove the *Popes* power of reſtoring *Biſhops by Divine right, and that this was acknowledged by the whole Church.* *L. 7. c. 4. ſect. 6.*

The next thing to be conſidered is that ſpeech of St. *Auguſtine, That in the Church of* Rome *there did alwayes flouriſh the Principality of an Apoſtolick Chair.* As to which his Lordſhip ſaith, *That neither was the word* Principatus *ſo great, nor the Biſhops of thoſe times ſo little, as that* Principes *and* Principatus *are not commonly given them both by the Greek and Latin Fathers of this great and learnedſt age of the Church made up of the fourth and fifth hundred years, alwayes underſtanding* Principatus *of their ſpiritual power, and within the limits of their ſeveral juriſdictions, which perhaps now and then they did occaſionally exceed. And there is not one word in St.* Auguſtine, *that this Principality of the Apoſtolick Chair in the Church of* Rome *was then, or ought* §. 9.

In Romana Eccleſiâ ſimper Apoſtolicæ Cathedræ viguit Principatus. S. Aug. Epiſt. 162. P. 168.

to be now exercised over the whole Church of Christ as Bellarmin *insinuates there, and as* A. C. *would have it here.* To all this you say nothing to pur-
P. 184. pose; but only tell us, *That the Bishop by this makes way to some other pretty perversions* (as you call them) *of the same Father. For we must know,* say you, *that he is entering upon that main Question concerning the Donatists of* Africk; and he is so indeed, and that not only for clearing the meaning of St. *Augustine* in the present Epistle, but of the whole Controversie, to which a great light will be given by a true account of those proceedings. Thus
P. 169. then his Lordship goes on. *And to prove that St.* Augustine *did not intend by* Principatus *here to give the Roman Bishop any power out of his own limits (which God knows were far short of the whole Church) I shall make it most manifest out of the same Epistle. For afterwards (saith St.* Augustine) *when the pertinacy of the Donatists could not be restrained by the* African *Bishops, only they gave them leave to be heard by forraign Bishops. And after that he hath these words: And yet peradventure* Melciades *the Bishop of the Roman Church, with his Colleagues the transmarine Bishops,* non debuit, *ought not to usurp to himself this judgement which was determin'd by seventy* African *Bishops;* Tigisitanus, *sitting Primate. And what will you say if he did not usurp this power? for the Emperour being desired, sent Bishops Judges, which should sit with him, and determine what was just upon the whole cause. In which passage,* saith his Lordship, *there are very many things observable. As first, That the Roman Prelate came not in till there was leave for them to go to Transmarine Bishops. Secondly, That if the Pope had come in without this leave, it had been an Usurpation. Thirdly, That when he did thus come in, not by his own Authority, but by Leave, there were other Bishops made Judges with him. Fourthly, That these other Bishops were appointed and sent by the Emperour and his power; that which the Pope least of all will endure. Lastly, Lest the Pope and his Adherents should say, this was an Usurpation in the Emperour, St.* Austin *tells us a little before in the same Epistle still, that this doth chiefly belong* ad curam ejus, *to the Emperours care and charge, and that he is to give an account to God for it. And* Melciades *did sit and judge the business with all Christian Prudence and Moderation. So at this time the Roman Prelate was not received as Pastour of the whole Church, say* A. C. *what he please; nor had he Supremacy over the other Patriarchs.* In order to the better shaping your Answer to this Discourse, you pretend to give us a *true Narrative* of the *Donatists* proceedings, by the same figure that *Lucians* Book is inscribed *De vera historia.* There are several things therefore to be taken notice of in your Narrative, before we come to your particular Answers, whose strength depends upon the matters of *fact.*

Tergant ad Fratres & Collegas nostros transmarinarum Ecclesiarum Episcopos. S. Aug. Ep. 162.

An forte non debuit Romanæ Ecclesiæ Melciades Episcopus, cum Collegis transmarinis Episcopis illud sibi usurpare judicium quod ab Afris Septuaginta, ubi Primas Tigisitanus præsedit, fuerit terminatum. Quid quod nec ipse usurpaverit? Rogatus quippe Imperator, Judices misit Episcopos, qui cum to sederent, & de totâ illâ causâ, quod justum videretur, statuerent. S. Aug. ib.

Ad cujus curam, de quâ rationem Deo redditurus est, res illa maximè pertinebat. Id. ib.

First, You give no satisfactory account at all, Why, if the *Popes Universal Pastourship* had been then owned, the first *appeal* on both sides was not made to the *Bishop of* Rome; for in so great a *Schism* as that was between the different parties of *Cæcilian* and *Majorinus,* To whom should they have directly gone but to *Melchiades* then *Bishop* of *Rome?* How comes it to pass that there is no mention at all of his *judgement* by either party, till *Constantine* had appointed him to be one of the *Judges?* St. *Austin* indeed pleads in behalf of *Cæcilian,* why he would not be judged by the *African Synod of LXX. Bishops, that there were thousands of his Colleagues on the other side the Sea, whom he might be tryed by.* But why not by the
Aug. ep. 162. *Bishop of* Rome *alone,* if the *Universal Pastourship* did belong to him? But your Narrative gives us a rare account, why the *Donatists* did not go

to

to the *Pope* before they went to the *Emperour*, viz. *That they durſt not appear there, or elſe knew it would be to little purpoſe.* But by what Arguments do you prove *they durſt not appear there before*, when we ſee they went readily thither *after* the *Emperour* had appointed *Rome* for the place, where their cauſe was to be heard; if they thought it were to ſo little purpoſe? For we ſee the *Donatiſts* never except againſt the *place* at all, or the *perſon* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*; but upon the command of *Conſtantine* made known to them by *Anulinus* the *Proconſul* of *Africa*, ten of their party go to *Rome* to negotiate their affairs before the *Delegates*. This is but therefore a very lame account, why the *firſt appeal* ſhould be to the *Emperour* and not to the *Pope*, if he had been then known to be the *Univerſal Paſtour* of the *Church*. But ſay you further, *The Emperour diſliked their proceedings, and told them expreſly, That it belonged not to him, neither durſt he act the part of a Judge in a cauſe of Biſhops.* But on what grounds *he durſt not do it*, we may eaſily judge by his undertaking it at laſt, and paſſing a final judgement in this *cauſe* himſelf after the *Councils at* Rome, *at* Arles, could not put an end to it. If *Conſtantine* had judged it *unlawful*, could their importunity have excuſed it? and could it be any other than *unlawful* if the *Pope* were the *Univerſal Paſtour* of the *Church?* Do you think it would be accounted a ſufficient plea among you now, for any *Prince* to aſſume to himſelf the judgement of any cauſe already determined by the *Pope*, becauſe of the *importunity* of the perſons concerned in it? Indeed *Conſtantine* did at firſt prudently wave the buſineſs himſelf, and that I ſuppoſe the rather becauſe the *Donatiſts* in their Petition had intreated that ſome of the *Biſhops* of *Gaul* might umpire the buſineſs; either becauſe that was then the place of the *Emperours* reſidence, or elſe that *Gaul* under *Conſtantius* had eſcaped the late perſecution, and therefore were not lyable to the ſuſpicion of thoſe crimes whereof *Cæcilian* and *Felix* of *Aptung* were accuſed. But however though *Conſtantine* did not ſit as *Judge* himſelf, he appointed *Marinus*, *Rheticius*, and *Maternus*, to joyn with *Melchiades* the *Biſhop* of *Rome* in the determining this caſe. *But this he did*, you ſay, *to comply with the Donatiſts.* What, to joyn other *Biſhops* with the *Head* of the *Church* in equal power for deciding Controverſies? and all this meerly to comply with the *Schiſmatical Donatiſts?* was this, think you, becoming one who believed the *Popes Univerſal Paſtourſhip by Divine Right?* Well fare then the Anſwer of others who love to ſpeak plain truths, and impute all theſe proceedings to *Conſtantines* Ignorance of his duty, being yet but a *Catechumen* in *Chriſtian Religion*, and therefore did, he knew not what: But methinks the *Univerſal Paſtour* or ſome of thoſe nineteen *Biſhops* who ſat at *Rome* in this buſineſs, or of thoſe two hundred who you ſay met afterwards at *Arles* about it, ſhould have a little better inſtructed him in his duty; and not let him go ſo far on in it, as from delegating *Judges* to hear it, and among them the *Head* of the *Church*, to reſume it afterwards himſelf both to hear and determine it. *If the Emperour had* (as you ſay) *proteſted againſt this as in it ſelf unlawful*, would none of the *Biſhops* hinder him from doing it? But where doth *Conſtantine* profeſs againſt it *as in it ſelf unlawful*? if ſo, no circumſtances, no importunities could ever make it lawful: Unleſs you think the *importunity* of *Joſephs Miſtreſs* would have made *adultery* no *ſin* in him. If *Conſtantine ſaid he would ask the Biſhops pardon in it*, that might be, as looking on them as the more competent *Judges*, but not thinking it *unlawful in it ſelf* for him to do, as you ſay,

P. 185.

P. 186.

Well, but you tell us, *It was rather the juſtice and moderation of the Roman Prelate, that he came not in before it was due time, and the matter orderly brought before him.* I am very much of your mind in this, and if all *Popes* ſince *Melchiades* had uſed *the ſame juſtice and moderation*, to have ſtaid till things

§. 10.

things had been orderly brought to them, and not uſurped upon the priviledges of other *Churches*, things had been in a far better condition in the Chriſtian world than they are. Had there been none but ſuch as *Melchiades*, who ſhewed ſo much Chriſtian prudence and moderation in the management of this buſineſs, that great *Schiſm*, which your *Church* hath cauſed by her arrogant pretences, might have been prevented. But how come you to know, *that this caſe did properly belong to the Popes cognizance?* who told you this? to be ſure not the Emperour *Conſtantine*, who in his Epiſtle to *Miltiades*, extant in *Euſebius*, intimates no ſuch thing; but only writes to him as one *delegated* to hear that cauſe with the other *Biſhops* and gives him *Inſtructions* in order to it. Do the *Donatiſts* or their *Adverſaries* mention any ſuch thing? Doth the *Pope* himſelf ever expreſs or intimate it? It ſeems, he wanted your *information* much at that time. Or it may be, like the late Pope *Innocent* in the caſe of the five *propoſitions*, he might ſay, *he was bred no Divine*, and therefore might the leſs underſtand his duty. But can it poſſibly enter into your head, *that this caſe came to the Pope at laſt by way of regular appeal*, as you ſeem to aſſert afterwards? Is this the way of *appeals* to go to the *Emperour* and Petition him to appoint *Judges* to hear the caſe? If the caſe of *appeals* muſt be determined from theſe *proceedings*, to be ſure, the *laſt reſort* will be to the *Emperour* himſelf, as well as the *firſt appeal*.

Euſeb. l. 10. c. 5.

Whether *the* African *Biſhops gave leave to the Donatiſts to be heard by forraign Biſhops, or they took it themſelves*, is not much material; becauſe the *Schiſm* was ſo great at home, that there was no likelihood of any ending the Controverſie by ſtanding to a fair *arbitration* among themſelves. And therefore there ſeemed a neceſſity on both ſides of referring the buſineſs to ſome unconcerned perſons who might hear the *Allegations* and judge indifferently between them. And no other way did the nineteen *Biſhops* at *Rome* proceed with them, but as indifferent Arbitrators; and therefore the Witneſſes and Allegations on both ſides were brought before them; but we read of no *power* at all challenged abſolutely to bind the perſons to the judgement of the *Church* of *Rome*, as the final judgement in the caſe. The Queſtion, *Whether the Pope had uſurped this power or no*, depends not upon the *Donatiſts Queſtion, Whether* Melchiades *ought to have undertaken the judgement of that cauſe which had been already determined by a Synod of LXX. Biſhops in* Africk? But upon St. *Auguſtines* Anſwer, who juſtifies the lawfulneſs of his doing it, becauſe he was thereto appointed by the *Emperour*. But when you ſay, *St.* Auſtin *gives this anſwer only* per ὑποίκισιν, *by way of condeſcenſion to his adverſaries way of ſpeaking*: you would do well to prove elſewhere from St. *Auſtin* that when he lays aſide his *Rhetorick* he ever ſpeaks otherwiſe, but that it would have been an *Uſurpation* in the *Pope* to challenge to himſelf the hearing of thoſe *cauſes* which had been determined by *African Biſhops*. But what St. *Auguſtines* judgement as well as the other *African Fathers* was in this point abundantly appears from the Controverſies between them and the *Biſhop* of *Rome* in the caſe of *Appeals*. It ſufficiently appears already, *That neither our Saviour, nor the Canons of the Univerſal Church gave the Pope leave to hear and judge the cauſes of St.* Athanaſius *and other Patriarchs and Biſhops of the Church*; and therefore you were put to your ſhifts when you run thither for ſecurity. But that which follows is notoriouſly falſe, *That when he did ſo interpoſe, no man (no not the perſons themſelves who were intereſſed and ſuffered by his judgement) complained or accuſed him of uſurpation*; when in the caſe of *Athanaſius* it is ſo vehemently pleaded by the *Eaſtern Biſhops* that the *Pope* had nothing at all to do in it; but they might as well call in Queſtion what was done at *Rome*, as he what was done at *Antioch*. Nay name us any one cauſe in that age of the *Church*, where

P. 187.

where the *Pope* did offer to meddle in matters determined by other *Biſhops*, which he was not oppoſed in, and the perſons concern'd did not complain and accuſe him of meddling with what he had no right to, which are but other words for *Uſurpation*.

§. 11. You ſay, *The Biſhops whom the Emperour ſent as Judges with the Pope, were an inconſiderable number to ſway the ſentence.* It ſeems *three to one* are with you an inconſiderable number. But ſay you, *The Pope to ſhew his authority added fifteen other Biſhops of* Italy *to be his Colleagues and Aſſiſtants in the buſineſs.* Either theſe fifteen *Biſhops* were properly *Judges* in the cauſe, or only *Aſſiſtants* for better management and ſpeedier diſpatch; if they were *Judges*, how prove you that *Conſtantine* did not appoint them? if they were only *aſſiſtants* and *ſuffragans* to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, as is moſt probable (except *Merocles* Biſhop of *Milan*) what *authority* did the *Pope* ſhew in calling his *Suffragans* to his *aſſiſtance* in a matter of that nature, which required ſo much examination of *Witneſſes?* But the *Pope* had more effectually ſhewn his authority if he had refuſed the *Biſhops* whom *Conſtantine* ſent; and told him he medled with that which did not concern him, to appoint any *Judges* at all in a matter of *Eccleſiaſtical cogniſance*, and that it was an inſufferable preſumption in him to offer to ſend three underling *Biſhops* to ſit with him in deciding Controverſies; as though he were not the *Univerſal Paſtour* of the *Church* himſelf, *to whom alone by Divine right* all ſuch things did belong. Such language as this would have become the *Head of the Church*; and in that indeed he had ſhewn his authority. But for him ſneakingly to admit other *Biſhops* as *joynt-commiſſioners*, forſooth, with him; and that by the *Emperours* appointment too; What did he elſe but betray the *rights* of his *See*, and expoſe his *Infallible Headſhip* to great contempt? Do you think that *Pope Hildebrand* or any of his *Succeſſours* would have done this? No, they underſtood their power far better than ſo; and the *Emperour* ſhould have known his own, for offering ſuch an *Affront* to his *Holineſs*. And if his *Bay-leaves* did not ſecure him, the *Thunder-bolts* of Excommunication might have lighted on him to his prejudice. For ſhame then never ſay, *That Pope* Miltiades *ſhewed his authority*; but rather give him over among thoſe *good Biſhops* of *Rome* but *bad Popes*, who knew better how to ſuffer *Martyrdom*, than aſſert the *Authority* of the *Roman See*. I pray imagine but *Paul* 5 or any other of our ſtout-ſpirited Popes in *Miltiades* his place, Would they have taken ſuch things at *Conſtantines* hands as poor *Miltiades* did? and, for all that we ſee, was very well contented too; and thought he did but his duty in doing what the *Emperour* bid him. Would they have been contented to have had a cauſe once paſſed the *Infallable judgement* of the *Roman See*, to be reſumed again, and handled in another *Council*, as though there could be any ſuſpicion that all things were not rightly carried there? and that after all this too, the *Emperour* ſhould undertake to give the final deciſion to it? would theſe things have been born with by any of our *Infallible Heads* of the *Church?* But good *Miltiades* muſt be excuſed, he went as far as his knowledge carried him, and thought he might do good ſervice to the *Church* in what he did; and that was it he looked at more than the *grandeur* of his *See*. The good *Biſhops* then were juſt crept out of the *Flames* of perſecution, and they thought it a great matter that they had *liberty* themſelves, and did not much concern themſelves about thoſe *Uſurpations* which the *Pride* and *Eaſe* of the following ages gave occaſion for. They were ſorry to ſee a *Church* that had ſurvived the cruel *Flames* of *Diocleſians* perſecution, ſo ſuddenly to feel *new ones* in her own bowels; that a *Church* whoſe conſtitution was ſo ſtrong as to endure *Martyrdomes*, ſhould no ſooner be at eaſe but ſhe begins to putrifie, and to be *fly-blown* with heats

and

and diviſions among her members; and that her own *Children* ſhould rake in thoſe wounds, which the violence of her profeſſed enemies had cauſed in her; and therefore theſe good *Biſhops* uſed their care and induſtry to cloſe them up; and rather rejoyced they had ſo good an *Emperour* who would concern himſelf ſo much in healing the *Churches breaches*, than diſpute his *Authority* or diſobey his *Commands*. And if *Conſtantine doth expreſs himſelf unwilling to engage himſelf to meddle in a buſineſs concerning the Biſhops of the Church*, it was out of his tender reſpect to thoſe *Biſhops* who had manifeſted their piety and ſincerity ſo much in their late perſecutions, and not from any *Queſtion* of his own Authority in it. For that he after ſufficiently aſſerted, not only in his own actions, but when the caſe of *Felix* of *Aptung* was thought not ſufficiently ſcanned at *Rome*, in appointing (about four months after the judgement at *Rome*) *Elianus* the *Proconſul* of *Africa* to examine the caſe of *Felix* the *Biſhop* of *Aptung*, who had ordained *Cæcilian*. To this the *Donatiſts* pleaded, *That a Biſhop ought not to be tryed by Proconſular judgement:* to which St. *Auſtin* Anſwers, *That it was not his own ſeeking, but the Emperours appointing, to whoſe care and charge that buſineſs did chiefly belong, of which he muſt give an account to God.* And can it now enter into any head but *yours*, that for all this the *Emperour* looked on the judgement of this cauſe as *a thing not belonging to his Authority?* They who can believe ſuch things as theſe, and notwithſtanding all the circumſtances of this ſtory can think the *Popes Univerſal Paſtourſhip* was then owned, the moſt I can ſay of them, is, that they are in a fair way to believe *Tranſubſtantiation*; there being nothing ſo improbable, but upon equal grounds they may judge it true.

Valeſius de Schiſmate Donatiſt. cap. 11.

Ait quidam, Non debuit Epiſcopus Proconſulari judicio purgari: quaſi vero ipſe ſibi hoc comparaverit, ac non Imperator ita quæri juſſerit, ad cujus curam de quâ rationem Deo redditurus eſſet, res illa maxime pertinebat. Auguſtin. ep. 162.

§. 12. P. 170. *That the Pope had no Supremacy over other Patriarchs*, his Lordſhip ſaith, *That, were all other Records of Antiquity ſilent, the Civil Law is proof enough; And that's a Monument of the Primitive Church. The Text there is,* A Patriarchâ non datur appellatio. *From a Patriarch there lyes no appeal. No appeal. Therefore every Patriarch was alike Supreme in his own Patriarchate. Therefore the Pope then had no Supremacy over the whole Church. Therefore certainly not then received as univerſal Paſtor.* Two things you anſwer to this. 1. *That this reacheth not the difference between Patriarchs themſelves, who muſt have ſome higher ordinary Tribunal, where ſuch cauſes may be heard and determined.* Very well argued againſt the *Pope's* power of judging: for, in caſe of a difference between him and the other *Patriarchs*, who muſt decide the difference? Himſelf no doubt! But ſtill, it is your way to beg that you can never prove? for you herein ſuppoſe the *Pope to be above all Patriarchs*, which you know is the thing in diſpute. Or, Do you ſuppoſe it very poſſible, that other *Patriarchs* may quarrel and fall out among themſelves; but that the *Popes* are alwayes ſuch mild and good men, that it is impoſſible any ſhould fall out with them, or they with others; that ſtill they muſt ſtand by as unconcerned in all the quarrels of the *Chriſtian world*, and be ready to receive complaints from all places. If therefore a *General Council* muſt not be the *Judge* in this caſe, I pray name ſomewhat elſe more agreeable to reaſon, and the practice of the *Church*. But you anſwer. 2. *What the Law ſaith, is rightly underſtood, and muſt be explicated of inferiour Clerks only, who were not (of ordinary courſe) to appeal further than the Patriarch, or the Primate of their Province. For ſo the Council of* Africk *determines. But 'tis even there acknowledged, that Biſhops had power in their own cauſes to appeal to* Rome. This anſwer of yours neceſſarily leads us to the debates of the great caſe of appeals to *Rome*, as it was managed between the *African Biſhops*, and the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, by which we

Cod. l. 1. Tit. 4. l. 29. Authent. Collat. 9. tit. 15. c. 22.

P. 188. n. 4.

Concil. Afric. Can. 101. Epiſt. ad Bonifac.

we ſhall eaſily diſcover the *weakneſs* of your anſwer, and the moſt palpable *fraud* of your citation; by which we may ſee, What an excellent cauſe you have to manage, which cannot be defended but by ſuch *frauds* as here you make uſe of, and hope to impoſe upon your Reader by. Your Anſwer therefore in the general is, *That the Laws concerning appeals, did only concern inferiour Clergy-men; but that Biſhops were allowed to appeal to* Rome, *even by the Council of* Africk, *which not only decreed it, but acknowledged it in an Epiſtle to Pope* Boniface. And therefore for our through underſtanding the truth in this caſe, thoſe proceedings of the *African Church* muſt be briefly explained, and truly repreſented. Two occaſions the *Churches* of *Africa* had to determine in the caſe of *Appeals* to *Rome*; the firſt in the *Milevitan*, the ſecond in the *Carthaginian Councils*: in both which we have ſeveral things very conſiderable to our purpoſe. In the *Milevitan Council* they decree, *That whoſoever would appeal beyond the Sea, ſhould not be received into Communion by any in* Africa; which decree is ſuppoſed by ſome to be occaſioned by *Cæleſtius*, having recourſe to *Pope Zoſimus*, after he had been condemned in *Africa*. No doubt, thoſe prudent *Biſhops* began to be quickly ſenſible of the monſtrous inconvenience which would ſpeedily follow upon the permiſſion of ſuch *appeals* to *Rome*; for by that means they ſhould never preſerve any diſcipline in their *Churches*, but every perſon, who was called in *Queſtion* for any crimes, would ſlight the *Biſhops* of thoſe *Churches*, and preſently appeal to *Rome*. To prevent which miſchief, they make that *excellent Canon*, which allows only liberty of appealing to the *Councils* of *Africa*, or to the *Primates* of their *Provence*, but abſolutely forbids all forraign appeals. All the difficulty is, Whether this *Canon* only concerned the *Inferiour Clergy*, as you ſay, (and which is all that the greateſt of your ſide have ſaid in it) or, whether it doth not take away all appeals of *Biſhops* too. For which we need no more than produce the *Canon* it ſelf, as it is extant in the authentick collection of the *Canons* of the *African Church*. In which is an expreſs clauſe, *declaring that the ſame thing had been often determined in the caſe of Biſhops*. Which, becauſe it ſtrikes home, therefore *Perron* and others have no other ſhift, but to ſay, That this clauſe was not in the original *Milevitan Canons*, but was inſerted afterwards. But why do not they, who aſſert ſuch bold things, produce the true authentick Copy of theſe *Milevitan Canons?* that we may ſee, What is genuine, and what not: But, ſuppoſe we ſhould grant, that this clauſe was inſerted afterwards, it will be rather for the advantage, than prejudice of our cauſe. For which we muſt conſider, that in the time of *Aurelius Biſhop* of *Carthage*, there had been very many *Councils* celebrated there: no fewer than ſeventeen *Juſtellus* and others reckon. But a general *Council* meeting at *Carthage*, A. D. 419. (which was about three years after that *Milevitan Council* which was held 416. as appears by the Anſwer of *Innocentius* to it, *A. D.* 417.) at the end of the firſt Seſſion they reviewed the *Canons* of thoſe leſſer *Councils*, and out of them all compoſed that *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Africanæ*, as *Juſtellus* at large proves in the preface to his edition of it. So that if this clauſe were inſerted, it muſt be inſerted then, for it is well known, that the caſe of *Appeals* was then at large debated; and by that means it received a more general authority by paſſing in this *African Council*. And hence it was that this *Canon* paſſed with this clauſe into the *Greek Churches*; for *Balſamon* and *Zonaras* both acknowledge it; and not only they, but many ancient *Latin Copies* had it too, and is ſo received and pleaded by the *Council* of *Rhemes*; as *Hincmarus*, and others, have already proved. But *Gracian* hath helped it well out, for he hath added a brave Antidote at the end of it, by putting to it a very

Item placuit ut Presbyteri, diaconi, vel cæteri inferiores Clerici, in cauſis quas habuerint, ſi de judiciis epiſcoporum ſuorum queſti fuerint, vicini epiſcopi, eos cum conſenſu epiſcopi ſui audiant, & inter eos definiant, adhibiti ab eis epiſcopi: quod ſi & ab iis provocandum putaverint, non provocent ad tranſmarina judicia; ſed ad primates ſuarum provinciarum, aut ad univerſale Concilium; Sicut de Epiſcopis ſæpe conſtitutum eſt. *Ad tranſmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, à nullo intra Africam ad Communionem ſuſcipiatur, Codex Canon.* Eccleſ. African. Can. 28.

useful clause, *Nisi forte Romanam Sedem appellaverit*; by which the *Canon* makes excellent sense, that none shall appeal to *Rome*, unless they do appeal to *Rome*; for none who have any understanding of the state of those *Churches* at that time, do make the least Question, but the intent of the *Canon* was to prohibit appeals to *Rome*; but then, say they, They were only *the appeals of the Inferiour Clergy, which were to be ended by the Bishops of their own Province.*

§. 13. But this Answer is very unreasonable on these accounts. 1. If Appeals do of right belong to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as *Universal Pastor of the Church*, then, Why not the *Appeals* of the *Inferiour Clergy*, as well as *Bishops?* Indeed, if *Appeals* were challenged only by virtue of the *Canons*, and those *Canons* limit one, and not the other (as the most eager pleaders for *Appeals* in that age, pleaded only the *Canons* of the *Church* for them) then there might be some reason, Why one should be restrained, and not the other; but if they belong to him by *Divine Right*, then all Appeals must necessarily belong to him. 2. If *Appeals* belong to the *Pope*, as *Universal Pastor*, then no *Council* or persons had any thing to do to determine who should appeal, and who not. For this were an usurping of the *Pope's privilege*, for he to whom only *the right of Appeals* belongs, can determine, Who should appeal, and who not; and where, and by whom those Controversies should be ended. So that the very act of the *Council* in offering to limit Appeals, implies that they did not believe any such *Universal Pastorship* in the *Pope*; for, had they done so, they would have waited his judgement, and not offered to have determined such things themselves. 3. The *Appeals* of the upper and inferiour *Clergy*, cannot be supposed to be separate from each other. For the Appeal of a *Presbyter* doth suppose the impeachment of the *Bishop* for some wrong done to him, as in the case of *Apiarius* accusing *Urban* the *Bishop* of *Sicca* for excommunicating him. So that the *Bishop* becomes a party in the *Appeal* of a *Presbyter*. And if *Appeals* be allowed to the *Bishop*, it is supposed to be in his favour, for clearing of his right the better; and if it be denied to the *Presbyter*, it would savour too much of injustice and partiality. 4. The reason of the *Canon* extends to one as well as the other, which must be supposed to prevent all those troubles and inconveniencies which would arise from the liberty of *Appeals* to *Rome*; and, would not these come as well by the *Appeals* of *Bishops*, as of *Inferiour Clergy?* Nay, Doth not the *Canon* insist on that, that no *Appeals* should be made from the *Council* of *Bishops*, or the *Primates* of *Africa*; but, in case of *Bishops* Appeals, this would be done as well as the other: and therefore they are equally against the reason and design of the *Canon*. 5. The case of *Presbyters*, may be as great and considerable as that of *Bishops*, and as much requiring the judgement of the *Universal Pastor of the Church*. As, for instance, that very case which probably gave occasion to the *Milevitan Canon*, *viz.* the going of *Cœlestius* to *Rome*, being condemned of Heresie in *Africa*: Now, What greater cause could there be made an Appeal to *Rome* in, than in so great a matter of *Faith* as that was, about the necessity of *Grace?* And therefore *Petrus de Marcâ* proves at large against *Perron*, that in the Epistle of *Innocent* to *Victricius*, where it is said, *That the greater causes must be referred to the Apostolick See*, is not to be understood only of the *causes of Bishops*, but may referr to the *causes* of *Presbyters* too, *i. e.* when they either concern *matter of Faith*, or some *doubtful piece of Church discipline*. 6. The *Pope*, notwithstanding this *Canon*, looked on himself as no more hindred from receiving the Appeals of *Presbyters*, than those of *Bishops*. If therefore any difference had been made by any act of the *Church*, surely the *Pope* would have remanded *Presbyters* back to their own *Provinces* again; but, instead of that, we see, he received the Appeal of *Apiarius*. But, for this, a rare Answer is given, *viz. that though the Presbyters were forbidden to appeal, yet the Pope was not forbidden to receive them, if they did appeal.* But,

De Concord. Sacerdot. & Imp. l. 7. c. 13. sect. 6, 7, 9.

to

to what purpose then were such prohibitions made, if the *Pope* might by his open incouragement of them upon their Appeals to him, make them not value such *Canons* at all; for they knew, if they could but get to *Rome*, they should be received for all them.

§. 14. Notwithstanding all which hath been said, you tell us, *That in the Council of* Africk *it was acknowledged, that Bishops had power in their own cause, to appeal to* Rome; for which you cite in your Margent, *part of an Epistle of the Council to* Boniface. But, with what honesty and integrity you do this, will appear by the story. *Apiarius* then appealing to *Zosimus*, he sends over *Faustinus* to *Africa*, to negotiate the business of *Appeals*, and to restore *Apiarius*, for which he pleads the *Nicene Canons* (an account of which will be given afterwards) the *Fathers* all protest they could find no such thing there, but they agree to send Deputies into the *East*, to fetch the true *Canons* thence (as hath been related already) in the mean time *Zosimus* dyes, and *Boniface* succeeds him; but for the better satisfaction of the *Pope*, the *Council* of *Carthage* dispatch away a Letter to *Boniface*, to give him an account of their proceedings; in which Epistle (extant in the *African Code* of *Canons*) after they have given an account of the business of *Apiarius*, they proceed to the instructions which *Faustinus* brought with him to *Africa*, the chief of which is that concerning *Appeals* to be made to *Rome*, and then follow those words which you quote, in which they say, *That in a Letter written the year before to* Zosimus, *they had granted liberty to Bishops, to appeal to* Rome; and that therein *they had intimated so much to him.* Thus far you are right; but there is usually some mystery couched in your *&c.* for you know very well, where to cut off sentences; for, had you added but the next words, they had spoiled all your foregoing; there being contained in them, the full reason of what went before, *viz. that because the Pope pretended that the Appeals of Bishops were contained in the Nicene Canons, they were contented to yield that it should be so, till the true Canons were produced.* And is this now all their acknowledgement, that *Bishops* might in their own causes appeal to *Rome*, when they made only a *Provisional decree*, What should be done till the matter came to a resolution? But if you will throughly understand what their final judgement was in this business, I pray read their excellent Epistle to *Pope Celestine*, who succeeded *Boniface*; after they had received the *Nicene Canons* out of the *East*. Which being so excellent a Monument of *Antiquity*, and giving so great light to our present Controversie, I shall at large recite and render it, so far as concerns this business. *After our bounden duty of Salutation, we earnestly beseech you, that hereafter you admit not so easily to your ears those that come from hence, and that you admit no more into*

ut Romam liceat Episcopis provocare & ut Clericorum causæ apud suarum provinciarum episcopos finiantur, jam priore anno etiam literis nostris ad eundem venerabilis memoriæ Zosimum episcopum datis, insequari curavimus, &c.

ut ea servare sine ullâ ejus injuriâ paulisper sineremus, usq; ad exquisitionem statutorum Concilii Niceni.

Præfato itaq, debitæ Salutationis officio, impendio deprecamur, ut deinceps advestras aures hinc venientes

non facilius admittatis, nec à nobis excommunicatos in communionem ultrà velitis excipere; quia hoc etiam Niceno Concilio definitum facilè advertet Venerabilitas tua. Nam etsi de inferioribus Clericis vel de Laicis videtur ibi præcaveri, quanto magis hoc de episcopis voluit observari, nè in suâ provinciâ à communione suspensi à tuâ Sanctitate præproperè, vel indebitè videantur communioni restituì. Presbyterorum quoq; & sequentium Clericorum improba refugia, sicut te dignum est, repellat sanctitas tua, quia & nullâ Patrum definitione hoc ecclesiæ derogatum est Africanæ, & decreta Nicena sive inferioris gradus Clericos sive ipsos episcopos suis Metropolitanis apertissimè commiserunt. Prudentissimè enim justissimeq; vidêrunt, quæcunq; negotia in suis locis, ubi orta sunt, finienda; nec unicuiq; provinciæ gratiam Sancti Spiritus defuturam: quæ æquitas à Christi Sacerdotibus, & prudenter videatur, & constantissimè teneatur: maximè quia unicuiq; concessum est, si judicio offensus fuerit cognitorum, ad Concilia suæ provinciæ, vel etiam universale provocare. Nisi forte quisquam est qui credat, unicuilibet posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare justitiam; & innumerabilibus congregatis in Concilium Sacerdotibus denegare. Aut quomodo ipsum transmarinum judicium ratum erit, ad quod testium necessariæ personæ vel propter sexus, vel propter senectutis infirmitatem, vel multis aliis impedimentis adduci non poterunt? Nam ut aliqui tanquam à tuæ sanctitatis latere mittantur, nullâ invenimus Patrum Synodo constitutum. Quia illud quod pridem per eundem coepiscopum Faustinum tanquam ex parte Niceni Concilii exinde transmissistis, in Conciliis verioribus quæ accipiuntur Niceni, à S. Cyrillo coepiscopo nostro Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ, & à venerabili Attico Constantinopolitano Antistite, ex authentico missis, quæ etiam ante hoc per Innocentium Presbyterum & Marcellum Subdiaconum, per quos ad nos ab iis directa sunt, venerabilis memoriæ Bonifacio episcopo decessori vestro à nobis transmissa sunt, in quibus tale aliquid non potuimus invenire. Executores etiam Clericos vestros quibusq; petentibus nolite mittere, nè famosum typhum seculi in Ecclesiam Christi quæ lucem simplicitatis & humilitatis diem Deum videre cupientibus præfert, videamur inducere. Nam de fratre nostro Faustino (amoto jam, pro suis nisandis nequitiis, de Christi Ecclesiâ dolendo Apiario) secuti sumus, quod eum probitate ac moderatione tuæ sanctitatis, salvâ fraternâ charitate ulterius Africa minimè patiatur. Concil. Carthag. Epist. ad Cælestinum.

communion, those whom we have cast out: for your Reverence will easily perceive, that this is forbid by the Council of Nice. *For if this be taken care for, as to the Inferiour Clergy and Laity, How much more would it have it to be observed in Bishops; that so they who are in their own Province suspended from communion, be not hastily or unduly admitted by your Holiness. Let your Holiness also reject the wicked refuges of Priests and Inferiour Clerks; for no Canon of the Fathers hath taken that from the Church of* Africk; *and the decrees of* Nice *hath subjected both the Inferiour Clergy, and Bishops, to their Metropolitans. For they have most wisely and justly provided, that every business be determined in the place where it begun: and that the Grace of the Holy Spirit will not be wanting to every Province, that so equity may be prudently discovered, and constantly held by Christ's Priests. Especially seeing that it is lawful to every one, if he be offended, to appeal to the Council of the Province, or even to an Universal Council. Unless perhaps that some body believe that God can inspire to every one of us, the justice of examination of a cause, and refuse it to a multitude of Bishops assembled in Council. Or, How can a judgement made beyond the Sea be valid, to which the persons of necessary witnesses cannot be brought, by reason of the infirmity of their sex and age, or of many other intervening impediments? For this sending of men to us from your Holiness, we do not find commanded by any Synod of the Fathers. And as for that which you did long since send to us by* Faustinus *our Fellow-Bishop, as belonging to the Council of* Nice, *we could not find it in the truest Copies of the Council, sent by holy* Cyril *our Colleague, Bishop of* Alexandria, *and by the venerable* Atticus *Bishop of* Constantinople: *which also we sent to your predecessor* Boniface, *of happy memory, by* Innocent *a Presbyter, and* Marcellus *a Deacon. Take heed also of sending to us any of your Clerks for executors, to those who desire it, lest we seem to bring the swelling pride of the world into the Church of Christ, which beareth the light of simplicity, and the brightness of humility before them that desire to see God. And concerning our Brother* Faustinus (Apiarius *being now for his wickedness cast out of the Church of Christ*) *we are confident, that our brotherly love continuing through the goodness and moderation of your Holiness,* Africa *shall no more be troubled with him.* Thus I have at large produced this noble Monument of the prudence, courage, and simplicity of the *African Fathers*; enough to put any reasonable man out of the fond conceit of an *Universal Pastorship* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*. I wonder not that *Baronius* saith, *There are some hard things in this Epistle,* that *Perron* sweats and toils so much to so little purpose, to enervate the force of it; for, as long as the records of it last, we have an impregnable Bulwark against the *Usurpations* of the *Church* of *Rome*. And methinks you might blush for shame to produce those *African Fathers*, as determining the Appeals of *Bishops* to *Rome*, who, with as much evidence and reason, as courage and resolution, did finally oppose it. What can be said more convincingly against these *Appeals*, than is here urged by them: That they have neither authority from *Councils*, nor any *Foundation* in *Justice* and *Equity*; that *God's presence* was as well in *Africk* as *Rome* (no doubt then they never imagined any *Infallibility* there) that the proceedings of the *Roman Bishop* were so far from the *simplicity* and *humility* of the *Gospel*, that they tended only to nourish *swelling pride*, and *secular ambition* in the *Church*. That the *Pope* had no authority to send *Legats* to hear causes, and they hoped they should be no more troubled with such as *Faustinus* was. All these things are so evident in this testimony, that it were a disparagement to it to offer more at large to explain them. I hope then, this will make you sensible of the injury you have done the *African Fathers*, by saying, that they determined, the causes of *Bishops* might be heard at *Rome*.

§. 15. Greg. l. 11. Indict. 6. ep. 54. Your Answer to the place of S. *Gregory*, which his Lordship produceth concerning Appeals, *viz. that the Patriarch is to put a final end to those causes, which*

which come before him by Appeal from Biſhops and Arch-Biſhops, is the very ſame, that it ſpeaks only of the *Inferiour Clergy*, and therefore is taken off already. *But you wonder his Lordſhip ſhould expoſe to view the following words of S.* Gregory, *where there is neither Metropolitan, nor Patriarch of that Dioceſe, there they are to have recourſe to the See Apoſtolick, as being the Head of all Churches. Then ſurely it follows, ſay you, the Biſhop of* Rome's *Juriſdiction, is not only over the Weſtern, and Southern Provinces, but over the whole Church, whither the Juriſdiction of Patriarchs and Metropolitans never extended.* See how well you make good the common ſaying, That *Ignorance is the cauſe of Admiration*; for, Wherefore ſhould you *wonder* at his Lordſhips producing theſe words; if you had either underſtood, or conſidered the abundant Anſwers which he gives to them? 1. *That if there be a Metropolitan, or a Patriarch, in thoſe Churches, his judgement is final, and there ought to be no Appeal to* Rome. P. 171. 2. *It is as plain, that in thoſe ancient times of Church-Government*, Britain *was never ſubject to the See of* Rome (of which afterwards.) 3. *It will be hard for any man to prove, that there were any Churches then in the world, which were not under ſome either Patriarch or Metropolitan.* 4. *If any ſuch were*, 'tis gratis dictum, *and impoſſible to be proved, that all ſuch Churches, where-ever ſeated in the world, were obliged to depend on* Rome. And, Do you ſtill wonder why his Lordſhip produces theſe words? I may more juſtly *wonder* why you return no Anſwer to what his Lordſhip here ſayes. But ſtill the *Caput omnium Eccleſiarum* ſticks with you; if his Lordſhip hath not particularly ſpoken to that, it was, becauſe his whole diſcourſe was ſufficient to a man of ordinary capacity, to let him ſee, that no more could be meant by it, but ſome *preheminence* of that *Church* above others in regard of *order* and *dignity*, but no ſuch thing as *Univerſal Power and Juriſdiction* was to be deduced from it. And if *Gregory* underſtood more by it, as his Lordſhip ſaith, 'Tis *gratis dictum*, and *Gregory* himſelf was not a perſon to be believed in his own cauſe. But now, as you expreſs it, *his Lordſhip takes a leap from the Church of* Rome, *to the Church of* England: P. 188. No, neither his Lordſhip, nor we, take a *leap* from thence hither; but you are the men who *leap* over the *Alps*, from the *Church* of *England*, to that of *Rome*. We plead as his Lordſhip doth truly, *That in the ancient times of the Church*, Britain *was never ſubject to the See of* Rome, *but being one of the Weſtern Dioceſes of the Empire, it had a Primate of its own.* This, you ſay, his Lordſhip ſhould have proved, and not meerly ſaid. But, What P. 189. an unreaſonable man are you, who would put his Lordſhip to prove *Negatives*; if you challenge a right which the *Pope* hath over us, it is your buſineſs to prove it; his Lordſhip gave a ſufficient reaſon for what he ſaid, *in ſaying that* Britain *was one of the Dioceſes of the Empire, and therefore had a Primate of her own.* This you deny not, but ſay, this only proves, *That the Inferiour Clergy could not appeal to* Rome. What again? but this ſubterfuge hath been prevented already. But to paſs by what without any ſhadow of proof you ſay *of the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople's *being ſubject to the Pope*; *and Pope* Urban's *calling* Anſelm *the Patriarch of the other world*; which we are far from making the leaſt ground to make *Canterbury* a *Patriarchal See*; which, as far as concerns the rights of *Primacy*, was ſo long before the *Synod* of *Bar* in *Apulia*; we come to that which is more material, *viz.* your attempt to prove, *That* Britain *was anciently ſubject to the See of* Rome; for which you inſtance *in* Wilfrid *Arch-Biſhop of* York *appealing to* Rome, *about* A. D. 673. *who was reſtored to his Biſhoprick by virtue of the ſentence paſſed in his behalf at* Rome; *and ſo being a ſecond time expelled, appealed as formerly, and was again reſtored.* To which I ſhall return you a clear and full Anſwer in the words of another *Arch-Biſhop*, the late learned *L. Primate of* Ireland. "The moſt famous, ſaith he, (I had almoſt ſaid the "only) Ibid. n. 5. Bed. l. 5. c. 20. Bramhall Juſt. Vindication c. 4. p. 60.

"only) appellant from *England* to *Rome* that we read of before the Con-
"queſt, was *Wilfride* Arch-biſhop of *York*, who, notwithſtanding that he
"gained ſentence upon ſentence at *Rome* in his Favour; and notwithſtand-
"ing that the *Pope* did ſend expreſs *Nuncio's* into *England*, on purpoſe to
"ſee his ſentence executed; yet he could not obtain his reſtitution or the
"benefit of his ſentence for ſix years during the *Reigns* of King *Egbert*
Spelman. Concil. An. 705. "and *Alfrede* his ſon. Yea King *Alfrede* told the *Popes Nuncio*'s expreſly,
"*That he honoured them as his Parents for their grave lives and honourable*
"*aſpects; but he could not give any aſſent to their Legation, becauſe it was*
"*againſt reaſon, that a perſon twice condemned by the whole Council of the* En-
"*gliſh ſhould be reſtored upon the Popes letter.* If they had believed the *Pope*
"to be their competent Judge; either as Univerſal *Monarch*, or ſo much as
"*Patriarch* of *Britain*, or any more than an honourable *Arbitratour* (which
"all the *Patriarchs* were, even without the bounds of their proper juriſdi-
"ctions) How comes it to paſs that two *Kings* ſucceſſively, and the great
"*Councils* of the *Kingdom*, and the other Archbiſhop *Theodore* with all the
"prime *Eccleſiaſticks*, and the flower of the *Engliſh Clergy*, did ſo long and
"ſo reſolutely oppoſe ſo many ſentences and meſſages from *Rome*, and con-
"demn him twice whom the *Pope* had abſolved? Conſider that *Wilfride*
"was an *Archbiſhop*, not an *Inferiour Clerk*; and if an appeal from *England*
"to *Rome* had been proper or lawful in any caſe, it had been ſo in this caſe.
"But it was otherwiſe determined by thoſe who were moſt concerned.
"*Malmsbury* ſuppoſeth, either by *Inſpiration*, or upon his own head, that the
"*King* and the Archbiſhop *Theodore*, were ſmitten with remorſe before
"their deaths, for the injury done to *Wilfride*, and the ſlighting the *Popes*
"ſentence, letter, and *Legats*. But the contrary is moſt apparently true;
"For firſt, it was not King *Alfrede* alone, but the great *Council* of the *King-*
"*dom* alſo; not *Theodore* alone, but the main body of the *Clergy*, that op-
"poſed the *Popes* letter, and the reſtitution of *Wilfride* in that manner as it
"was decreed at *Rome*. Secondly, after *Alfrede* and *Theodore* were both
"dead, we find the *Popes* ſentence, and *Wilfrides* reſtitution, ſtill oppoſed
"by the ſurviving *Biſhops* in the *Reign* of *Alfredes* ſon. To clear the matter
"paſt contradiction, let us conſider the ground of this long and bitter con-
"tention; *Wilfride* the *Archbiſhop* was become a great *Pluraliſt*, and had
"ingroſſed into his hands too many Eccleſiaſtical Dignities. The *King* and
"the *Church* of *England* thought fit to deprive him of ſome of them, and to
"confer them upon others. *Wilfride* appealed from their ſentence to
"*Rome*. The *Pope* gave ſentence after ſentence in favour of *Wilfride*. But
"for all his ſentences, he was not, he could not be reſtored, until he had
"quitted two of his Monaſteries which were in Queſtion, *Hongeſtildean*
"and *Ripon*, which of all others he loved moſt dearly, and where he was af-
"terwards interred. This was not a Conqueſt, but a plain waving of his
"ſentences from *Rome*, and yielding of the *Queſtion*; for thoſe had been
"the chief cauſes of the Controverſie. So the *King* and the *Church* after
"*Alfredes* death ſtill made good his concluſion, That it was againſt reaſon,
"that a perſon twice condemned by the whole *Council* of the *Engliſh*, ſhould
"be reſtored upon the *Popes Bull*. And as he did not, ſo neither did they
"give any aſſent to the *Popes Legation*. This I hope may ſuffice as a moſt
ſufficient Anſwer to your Objection from *Wilfrides* Appeal.

§. 16. But you would ſeem to urge yet further for the ancient ſubjection of *Britain* to the *Church* of *Rome*, in theſe words, *Again, is it not manifeſt out*
Bed. l. 1. c. 29. *of him* (Bede), *that even the Primitive original Inſtitution of our Engliſh Biſhops is from* Rome? And for this you cite a letter of *Pope Gregory* 1. to *Auguſtine* the *Monk*, whom you call our *Engliſh Apoſtle*; in which *Gregory grants to him the uſe of the Pall, the proper badge or ſign of Archiepiſcopal Dig-*

nity,

nity, and that he condescended, that he should ordain twelve Bishops under his jurisdiction, &c. *Behold here*, say you, *the original Charter, as I may say, of the Primacy of* Canterbury; *in this Letter and Mandate of the Pope it is founded; nor can it with any colour of reason be drawn from other origin. And by vertue of this Grant, have all the succeeding Bishops of that See enjoy'd the Dignity and Authority of Primats of this Nation.* From whence you very civilly charge his Lordship, *either with gross Ignorance if he knew it not; or with great Ingratitude if he knew it.* To which I Answer; that his Lordship knowing this no doubt very well, that *Gregory* sent *Austin* into *England*, &c. could not from thence think himself bound to submit to the *Roman Bishop*; and it had been more pertinent to your purpose, not to charge him with *Ingratitude*, but with *Disobedience*. For that was it which you ought to prove hence, that the Arch-bishop of *Canterbury* ought still to be subject to the Bishop of *Rome*, because *Gregory* 1. *made* Augustine *the first Arch-bishop of* Canterbury. A wonderful strong Argument no doubt! which out of charity to you, we must further examine; for you tell us, *The Original Charter of the Primacy of* Canterbury *is contained in that Grant.* To satisfie you as to this, two things are to be considered, the *Primacy* it self, and the *exercise* of it by a particular person in some particular place. If you speak of the *Primacy* it self, *i. e.* the *independent right* of Governing the *Churches* within the *Provinces* of *Britain*, then we utterly deny that this was contained in that Grant. For *Britain* having been a *Province* before, in which *Bishops* did Govern Independently on any *Forraign Bishop*, no *Forraign Bishops* could take away that *Priviledge* from it. I will not stand here to deduce the History of the *Bishops* of *Britain*, before *Augustines* coming into *England*; but it is as certain that there were such, as it is that St. *Augustine* ever came hither. For not only all our own Historians and *Bede* himself confess it; but it is most evident from the subscriptions of three of them to the *first Council* of *Arles*, *Eborius* of *York*, *Restitutus* of *London*, and *Adelfius de civitate Coloniâ Londinensium* (which some will have to be a mistake for *Colonia Camaloduni*, whether by that, *Colchester*, *Maldon*, or *Wincheſter* be meant as it is differently thought) from the presence of some of them at the *Sardican Synod* and the *Council of Ariminum*, as appears by *Athanasius* and others; but this I suppose you will not deny, that there were *Bishops* in *England* before *Austin* came. And, that these *Bishops* had then no dependence on the *See* of *Rome*, if it were not sufficiently evident from other Arguments, the relation of the proceedings in *Bede* himself between *Austin* and them, about submission, would abundantly discover, as likewise that there was then an *Arch-bishop* with *Metropolitical power* over them, whose ancient seat had been *Caerleon*. But I consider not this *Primacy* now as in any particular place, but in general as belonging to the *Provinces* of *Britain*, which I say had a *Primacy* belonging to it, (whether at *York* or *London* is not material) at the time of the *Council* of *Nice* (according to what hath been formerly said about the state of *Churches* then) Now the *Council* of *Nice* takes care *that the priviledges of all Churches should be preserved*, i. e. That where there had been a *Primacy* it should so continue. Now therefore I ask, How came this priviledge of *Britain* to be lost, which was not only confirmed with others by the *Nicene Council*, but by that of *Chalcedon* and *Ephesus*, in which the ancient priviledges of Churches are secured? what right had *Austin* the *Monk* to cassate the ancient *Metropolitical power* of the *Britannick Church*, and to require absolute subjection to himself? If the *Pope* made him *Arch-bishop* of *Canterbury*, by what right was he *Primate* over the *Britain Church?* How came the *Arch-bishop* then in being to lose his *Primacy* by *Austins* coming into *England?* Was it because the *Britannick Church* was then over run with *Pagan-Saxons*, and the visible power of it confined to a narrow P. 190.

narrow compaſs? Yet I doubt not, but there were many *Brittiſh Chriſtians* living here among the *Saxons*, though oppreſſed by them, as they were after by the *Normans* (for, Where is it that any conqueſt hath carried away all the inhabitants?) and that theſe did many of them retain their *Chriſtianity*, though not daring publickly to own it, there are many not improbable circumſtances to lead us to ſuppoſe. But we will grant that the face of the *Britannick Church* was only in *Wales*; what follows thence? that the whole *Province* had loſt its right? Let us ſuppoſe a caſe like this? as that the *Church* of *Rome* ſhould be over-run with a Barbarous people (as it was by the *Goths* and *Vandals*) and the inhabitants deſtroyed; theſe Barbarous people continuing in poſſeſſion of it, and that a *Biſhop* ſhould have been ſent from *Britain* to convert them to the Faith, and upon their Converſion to *Govern* thoſe *Churches*, and ſhould be made *Biſhop* of that place by the *Brittiſh Biſhops*; Whether would he be bound to continue alwayes in ſubjection to them or no? If not; but you ſay, *by his ſucceſſion in the See of* Rome *he enjoyes the priviledges of that See, though the inhabitants be altered*; the ſame I ſay of the *Britannick Churches*, though the inhabitants were altered, and *Saxons* ſucceeded the *Britains*, yet the priviledge of the *Church* remains ſtill as to its Primacy and Independency. And therefore the *Popes* making *Auguſtine* Archbiſhop, ſo as to give him withall the *Primacy* over the *Churches* in the *Province* of *Britain*, was an *Uſurpation* upon the *rights* of our *Church*, which had an abſolute and Independent *Primacy* within it ſelf; as it was in the caſe of the *Cyprian Biſhop*. As ſuppoſing thoſe ancient Sects of *Churches* which are over-run with *Turks* ſhould again be converted to *Chriſtianity*, the *Biſhops* of thoſe *Churches* as of *Epheſus* or the like would enjoy the ſame rights which the ancient *Biſhops* had; ſo we ſay it was in our caſe, though the Nation was then over-ſpread with *Paganiſm*, yet *Chriſtianity* returning, the priviledges of our *Churches* did return with it; and whoſoever were rightly conſecrated *Biſhops* of them would enjoy the ſame *rights* which they did before. So that *Gregory* might make *Auſtin* a *Biſhop* and ſend him to convert this Nation, by which he was capable to Govern the *Churches* here which he did convert, but he could not give to him the *right* over theſe *Churches*, which *Gregory* had no power over himſelf; neither could *Auſtin* or any other *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury* give away the *Primacy* of *England* by ſubmitting himſelf to the *Roman See*. What therefore is *Gregories Grant* to *Auſtin*, to the *Primacy* of *England*? If you ask then, How the *Archbiſhops* of *Canterbury* come to be *Primates* of *England*? I Anſwer, 1. This *Primacy* muſt be lodged ſomewhere; and it is not unalterably fixed to any certain place, becauſe the *Primacy* belongs to the *Church* and not to a particular *See*. 2. It is in the power of *Princes* to fix the *Metropolitan See* in what place is judged moſt convenient; thence have been the frequent removes of *Epiſcopal* and *Archiepiſcopal See*'s; as is evident in many examples in *Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory*, particularly in *Juſtiniana Prima* made a *Metropolis* by *Juſtinian*. 3. Where ever the *Primacy* is lodged it retains its *ancient priviledges*; ſo that there is no need of a ſucceſſion of our *Archbiſhops* from the *Brittiſh Archbiſhops* of *Caerleon* to preſerve the *Brittiſh Primacy*; but that *See* being removed by the *Power* of *Princes*; the *Primacy* ſtill remains the ſame, that it was in the *Brittiſh Metropolitans*. And thus I hope I have ſhewn you, that the *Original Charter of the Archbiſhop of* Canterbury's *Primacy*, was not contained in the *Popes* grant to *Auſtin*.

§. 17. P. 172. From hence we proceed again to the caſe of the *African Churches*; *for* (as his Lordſhip ſaith) *the* African *Prelates finding that all ſucceeding Popes were not of* Melchiades *his temper, ſet themſelves to aſſert their own liberties, and held it out ſtoutly againſt* Zozimus, Boniface 1. *and* Cæleſtine 1. *who were ſucceſſively Biſhops of* Rome. *At laſt, it was concluded in the ſixth*

Council

Council of Carthage, (*wherein were assembled two hundred and seventeen Bishops, of which St.* Augustine *himself was one*) *that they would not give way to such a manifest encroachment upon their rights and liberties; and thereupon gave present notice to* Cœlestine *to forbear sending his Officers amongst them, lest he should seem to induce the swelling pride of the World into the Church of Christ. And this is said to have amounted into a formal separation from the Church of* Rome; *and to have continued for the space of somewhat more than one hundred years. For which his Lordship produceth two publick instruments extant among the ancient Councils; the one an Epistle from* Boniface 2. *in whose time the reconciliation to* Rome *is said to be made by* Eulalius *then Bishop of* Carthage; *but the separation,* instigante Diabolo, *by the Temptation of the Devil. The other is an* exemplar precum, *or Copy of the Petition of the same* Eulalius, *in which he damns and curses all those his Predecessours, which went against the Church of* Rome. *Now his Lordship urges from hence; Either these Instruments are true, or false. If they be false, then* Boniface 2. *and his Accomplices at* Rome, *or some for them are notorious forgers, and that of Records of great consequence to the Government and peace of the whole Church of Christ, and to the perpetual Infamy of that See, and all this foolishly and to no purpose: On the other side, if these instruments be true; then 'tis manifest that the Church of* Africk *separated from the Church of* Rome; *which separation was either unjust, or just; if unjust then St.* Austin, Eugenius, Fulgentius, *and all those Bishops and other Martyrs which suffered in the Vandalick persecution, dyed in actual and unrepented Schism, and out of the Church; If it were just, then is it far more lawful for the Church of* England *by a National Council to cast off the Popes Usurpation, as she did, than it was for the* African *Church to separate; because then the* African *Church excepted only against the Pride of* Rome *in case of Appeals, and two other Canons less material; but the Church of* England *excepts* (*besides this grievance*) *against many corruptions in Doctrine, with which* Rome *at that time was not tainted. And St.* Austin *and those other famous men durst not thus have separated from* Rome, *had the Pope had that powerful Principality over the whole Church of Christ, and that by Christs own Ordinance and Institution as* A. C. *pretends he had.* This is the substance of his Lordships discourse to which we must consider what Answer you return. Which in short is, *That you dare not assert the credit of those two Instruments, but are very willing to think them forgeries; but you say, the Schismatical separation of the* African *Church from the* Roman *is inconsistent with the truth of story, and confuted by many pregnant and undeniable instances, which prove that the* Africans *notwithstanding the contest in the sixth Council of* Carthage *touching matter of Appeals, were alwayes in true Catholick Communion with the* Roman *Church, even during the term of this pretended separation. For which you produce the Testimony of Pope* Cœlestine *concerning St.* Austin, *the proceeding of Pope* Leo *in the case of* Lupicinus, *the Testimonies of* Eugenius, Fulgentius, Gregory, *and the presence of some* African *Bishops at* Rome. To all which I Answer; that either the *African Fathers* did persist in the decree of the *Council* of *Carthage*, or they did not: if they did persist in it, and no separation followed; then the casting off the *Usurpations* of the *Roman See* cannot incur the guilt of *Schism*; for these *African Bishops* did that, and it seems continued still in the *Roman Communion*; by which it is evident that the *Roman Church* was not so far degenerated then as afterwards, or that the Authority of those persons was so great in the *Church*, that the *Roman* Bishops durst not openly break with them, which is a sufficient account of what *Cœlestine* saith concerning St. *Austin*, that he lived and dyed in the Communion of the *Roman Church*. If you say the reason why they were in Communion with the *Roman Church* was because they did not persist; you must prove it by better instances than you have here brought; for some of them are sufficient proofs of the contrary. As appears by the case of *Lupicinus* an *African* P. 191.

Leo. ep. 87. c. 2. *Biſhop* appealing to *Leo*, who indeed was willing enough to receive him; but what of that? Did not the *African Biſhops* of *Mauritania Caſarienſis* excommunicate him notwithſtanding that appeal, and ordained another in his place; and therefore the *Pope* very fairly ſends him back to be tryed by the *Biſhops* of his *Province*. Which inſtance as it argues the *Popes* willingneſs to have brought up Appeals among them, ſo it ſhews the continuance
Greg. l. 1. ep. 75 of their ſtoutneſs in oppoſing them. And even *Pope Gregory* ſo long after, though in his time the buſineſs of Appeals was much promoted at *Rome*; yet he dares not challenge them from the Biſhops of *Africa*, but yields to them the enjoyment of thoſe priviledges which they ſaid they had enjoyed from the *Apoſtles* times. And the teſtimonies of *Eugenius*, and *Fulgentius* imply nothing of ſubjection to *Rome*, but a *Præeminence* which that *Church* had above all others, which it might have without the other; as *London* may I hope be the *Head-City* of *England*, and yet all other Cities not expreſs ſubjection to it. But if after that *Council* of *Carthage* the Biſhops of *Rome* did by degrees encroach upon the liberties of the *African Churches*, there is this ſufficient account to be given of it; that as the *Roman* Biſhops were alwayes watchful to take advantages to inhance their power, and that eſpecially when other *Churches* were in a ſuffering condition, ſo a fit opportunity fell out for them to do it in *Africa*; For not long after that *Council* of *Carthage*, fell out that diſmal perſecution of the *African Churches* by the irruption of the *Vandals*; in which all the Catholick Biſhops were baniſhed out of *Africa*, or lived under great ſufferings; and by a ſtrict edict of *Genſericus*, no new Biſhops were ſuffered to be ordained in the places of the former. This now was a fair opportunity for the Biſhop of *Rome* to advance his Authority among the ſuffering Biſhops; St. *Peters* pretended *Succeſſour* loving to *fiſh* in troubled waters, and it being fatal to *Rome* from the firſt Foundation of it, to advance her ſelf by the *ruins* of other places.

§. 18. But we are call'd off from the ruins of other *Churches*, to obſerve the methods whereby the *Popes* grew great under the *Emperours* which his Lordſhip gives an account of from *Conſtantines* time to *Charles* the *Great*, about five hundred years, which begins thus, *So ſoon as the Emperours be-*
P. 175. n. 12. *came Chriſtian, the Church began to be put in better order; For the calling and Authority of Biſhops over the Inferiour Clergy, that was a thing of known uſe and benefit for preſervation of Unity and Peace in the Church. Which was confeſſed by St.* Hierom *himſelf, and ſo ſettled in mens minds from the very Infancy of the Church, that it had not been to that time contradicted by any. The only difficulty then was to accommodate the places and precedencies of Biſhops, among themſelves, for the very neceſſity of order and Government. To do this the moſt equal and impartial way was, that as the Church is in the Common-wealth, not the Common-wealth in it,* (*as* Optatus *tells us*) *So the Honours of the Church ſhould follow the Honours of the State; and ſo it was inſinuated if not ordered* (*as appears*) *by the Canons of the Councils of* Chalcedon *and* Antioch. *And this was the very Fountain of the Papal Greatneſs; the Pope having his Reſidence in the great Imperial City. But Precedency is one thing, and Authority another; It was thought fit therefore, that among Biſhops there ſhould be a certain ſubordination and ſubjection. The Empire therefore being caſt into ſeveral Diviſions (which they call'd Dioceſes) every Dioceſe contained ſeveral Provinces, every Province ſeveral Biſhopricks; The chief of a Dioceſe was call'd* Ἐξαρχος, *and ſometimes a Patriarch; the chief of a Province a Metropolitan; next the Biſhops in their ſeveral Dioceſes* (*as we now uſe that word*), *among theſe there was effectual ſubjection reſpectively grounded upon Canon, and Poſitive Law, in their ſeveral Quarters; but over them, none at all: all the Difference there, was but* Honorary *not* Authoritative. To all this part of his Lordſhips Diſcourſe, you only ſay, *That it is founded upon his*

own

own conjectural presumptions more than upon any thing else; and that you have shewed a far different Fountain of the Popes Authority from Tu es Petrus, & super hanc Petram, *&c.* The meaning of what you say, is, That his Lordships Discourse hath two much Truth and Reason to be Answered solidly; but because it is against the *Popes* interest you defie him, and cross your self, and cry, *Tu es Petrus, &c*, and think, this will prevent its doing you any harm. For if we look for one dram of Reason against it, we must look somewhere else than in your Book, though you tell us, *You have often evidenced the contrary*; but when and where I must profess my self to seek, and I doubt shall continue so to the end of your Book. But his Lordship proceeds. *If the ambition of some particular persons did attempt now and then to break these bounds, it is no marvel: For no calling can sanctifie all that have it. And* Socrates *tells us, that in this way the Bishops of* Alexandria *and* Rome *advanced themselves to a great height* πέρα τ ἱερωσύνης *even beyond the quality of Bishops. Now upon view of story it will appear, that what advantage accrewed to* Alexandria, *was gotten by the violence of* Theophilus *Patriarch there. A man of exceeding great Learning and no less violence; and he made no little advantage out of this, that the Empress* Eudoxia *used his help for the casting of St.* Chrysostome *out of* Constantinople. *But the Roman Prelates grew by a steady and constant watchfulness upon all occasions to increase the honour of that See. Interposing and assuming to themselves to be* Vindices Canonum *(as* Greg. Naz. *speaks) Defenders and Restorers of the Canons of the Church, which was a fair pretence and took extreamly well. But yet the world took notice of this their aim. For in all Contestations between the East and West, which were not small, nor few, the Western Bishops objected Levity to the Eastern; and they again arrogancy to the Bishops of the West, as* Bilius *observes, and upon very warrantable testimonies. For all this, the Bishop of* Rome *continued in good obedience to the Emperour, enduring his censures and judgements: and being chosen by the Clergy and people of* Rome, *he accepted from the Emperour, the ratification of that choice. Insomuch that about the year* 579, *when all* Italy *was on fire with the Lombards, and* Pelagius *the second constrained through the necessity of the times contrary to the example of his Predecessours, to enter upon the Popedom without the Emperours leave, St.* Gregory *then a Deacon was shortly after sent on Embassie to excuse it.* To all these things you give one general Answer, by calling them *impertinencies*, which is a general name for all that you cannot Answer. *The Popes obedience to the Emperours you say was constrained, their ratifications of Popes elections only declaring them Canonical,* Socrates *was a Heretick, the Eastern Bishops partial:* This is the substance of all you say; whereof the two former are manifestly contrary to the truth of stories (as, when you desire it, may at large be manifested) and the two latter the pitiful shifts of such who have nothing else to say. P. 192. P. 177. P. 193.

But, though you cannot answer particulars, *you can overthrow his whole design* (though you cannot *Fiddle*, it seems you can conquer *Cities*, but they must be very weak then.) *His main design*, you tell us, *is to overthrow the Pope's Supremacy, by shewing, it was not lawful to appeal to* Rome; *but Catholick Authors* (to be sure you are in the number) *frame an unanswerable argument for his Supremacy, even from the contrary, thus; it was ever held lawful to appeal to* Rome *in Ecclesiastical affairs, from all the parts of Christendom; therefore, say they, The Pope must needs be Supreme Judge in Ecclesiastical matters. This is evidenced out of the* 4, *and* 7, *Canons of the Council of* Sardica, *accounted anciently an Appendix of the Council of* Nice, *and often cited as the same with it.* §. 19. P. 193. n. 9.

Will you give us leave to come near and handle this *unanswerable argument* a little? for persons of your profession use to be very shie of that. But however, since it is exposed to common view, we may take leave to do it. And seriously, upon consideration of all the parts and circumstances of it, I am of

your mind, without flattering you, that it is *an unanſwerable argument*, but quite to another purpoſe than you brought it for, even againſt the *Pope's Supremacy*, as I ſhall preſently diſcover; ſo that *thoſe Catholick Authors* have ſerved you juſt as *Lazarillo* did his blind Maſter, in bidding him leap over the water, that he might run his head full butt againſt the tree. For that which your beſt *Authors* ſhun as much as may be, and uſe their beſt arts to get beſides it, you run blindly, and therefore boldly upon it, as though it were an excellent argument to your purpoſe. You ſay, The evidence for Appeals, is from the *Canons* of the *Sardican Synod*, but if this be an unanſwerable argument for the *Pope's Supremacy*, 1. How come theſe *Appeals* to be pleaded from the *Sardican Synod?* 2. How come *theſe Appeals* to be denied, notwithſtanding the *Canons* of it? The former will prove that the *Supremacy*, if granted from hence, was not acknowledged from *Divine Right*; the latter, that it *was not univerſally acknowledged by the Church after*; and therefore both of them will make an *unanſwerable argument* againſt that which you would prove, *viz. the Pope's Supremacy*. Firſt, If the *Pope's Supremacy* be evidenced from hence, 1. How comes it at all to depend on the *Canons?* 2. Why no ſooner than the *Canons* of *Sardica?* 3. Why not at all mentioned in them? 1. How comes the *Pope's Supremacy*, if of *Divine Right*, to depend at all upon the *Canons* of the *Church?* We had thought it had been much more to your purpoſe, not to have mentioned any *Canons* at all of the *Church* about it, but to have produced evidences, that this was conſtantly acknowledged as of *Divine Inſtitution*. But we muſt bear with you, in not producing that which is not to be found. For nothing can be more apparent, than that when the *Popes* began to pierk up, they pleaded nothing but ſome *Canons* of the *Church* for what they did, as *Julius* to the *Oriental Biſhops*, *Zoſimus* to the *African*, and ſo others. If it had been ever thought then, that this *Supremacy* was of *Divine Right*; What ſenſeleſs men were theſe, to make uſe of the worſt pleas, and never mention the beſt? For, ſuppoſing they had ſuch a *Supremacy* granted them by the *Canons* of the *Church*, Doth not this imply that their authority did depend upon the *Churches* grant? and, what the *Church* might give for her own conveniency, ſhe might take it away, when ſhe ſaw it abuſed to her apparent prejudice. And therefore if they had thought that *God* had commanded all *Churches* to be ſubject to them, it was weakly done of them to plead nothing but the *Canons* of the *Church* for it. 2. Why no ſooner than the *Canons* of *Sardica?* Was the *Church* of *Rome* without her *Supremacy* till that time? Will no *Canons* of the *Church* evidence it before them? When this *Council* was not held till eleven years after the death of *Conſtantine*. Had the *Pope* no right of Appeals till it was decreed here? *Yes*, Zoſimus *pleads the Nicene Canons for it*; But upon what grounds, will appear ſuddenly. 3. Why is not the *Pope's Supremacy* mentioned as the ground of theſe Appeals then? Certainly thoſe *Weſtern Biſhops*, who made thoſe *Canons*, ſhould have only recognized the *Divine Right* of the *Pope's Supremacy*; and not made a *Canon* in ſuch a manner as they do; that would make any one be confident they never knew the *Popes Supremacy*. For their decree runs thus; *That in caſe any Biſhop thought himſelf unjuſtly condemned; if it ſeem good to you, let us honour the memory of* Peter *the Apoſtle, that it be written by thoſe who have judged the cauſe, to* Julius *the Biſhop of* Rome; *and if it ſeem good, let the judgement be renewed, and let them appoint ſuch as may take cognizance of it.* Were theſe men mad to make ſuch a *Canon* as this, if they believed the *Popes Supremacy* of *Divine Inſtitution?* What a dwindling expreſſion is that, for *the Head of the Church*, to call him *Biſhop*

Εἰ δέ τις ὁπισκόπων ἐν τινὶ πράγματι δίκῃ καλακίνεσθαι —— εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῖν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Πέτρᾳ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ τὴν μνήμην τιμήσωμεν, καὶ γραφῆναι παρὰ τῶν κρινάντων Ἰουλίῳ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης, ὅσε, διὰ τῆς πλησιόντων τὴν ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπων, εἰ δέοι ἀνανεωθῆναι τὸ δίκαιον, καὶ ἐπιγνώσεως αὐτὸς παρέχει. Concil. Sardic. c. 3.

Biſhop of Rome only, when a matter concerning his *Supremacy* is decreeing? And why to *Julius Biſhop of Rome*, I pray? Had it not been better to S. *Peter's Succeſſour*, whoſoever he be? ſo it would have been, no doubt, if they had intended a *Divine* or *Univerſal Right*. And why *for the honour of S.* Peter's *memory*? Had it not been more becoming them to have ſaid, *out of obedience to Chriſt's Commands*, which made him *Head of the Church*? And all this come in with an εἰ δοκεῖ, *if it pleaſe you*? What, *if it pleaſe you*, Whether the *Pope* ſhould be *Univerſal Paſtor*, or no? *If it pleaſe you*, Whether the *Church* ſhould be built *ſuper hanc Petram*, or no? *If it pleaſe you*, Whether the *Biſhop of* Rome *ſucceeds S.* Peter, or no? Are theſe the men that give ſuch evidence for the *Popes Supremacy*? You had better by far never mention them; for if that was the *Leſſon* they had to ſay, never any *Boyes* at *School* ſaid their *Leſſon* worſe than they do. They wanted ſuch as you among them, to have penned their *Canon* for them; and no doubt it had run in a better ſtrain; *For as much as our Lord and Saviour did appoint S.* Peter *Head of the Church, and the Biſhop of* Rome *to ſucceed him as Chriſt's Vicar upon earth; theſe are to let you know that he hath an abſolute power by Divine Right over all perſons and cauſes, and that men are bound to obey him upon pain of eternal damnation.* This had been ſomething like, if you could have found it in ſome *Canons* of the *Church*; but, to produce a poor ſneaking, *If it pleaſe you*, What do you elſe but betray the *Majeſty* and *Grandeur* of your *Church*? And yet after all this, no ſuch thing as abſolute *Appeals* to *Rome* are decreed here neither, but only that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* ſhould have power to review the caſe; and in caſe it was thought neceſſary, that other perſons ſhould be appointed to examine it. But, How much a *Review* differs from an *Appeal*, and that nothing but a power to review caſes is here given to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*; are fully manifeſted by *Petrus de Marcâ*, to whom I again referr you. So that we ſee from hence you have very comfortable evidence for the *Pope's Supremacy*.

De Concord. ſacerd. & Imp. l. 7. c. 3. ſect. 6, 7, &c. l. 7. c. 4. ſect. 2.

§. 20.

2. Suppoſe it had been decreed here, you had not gained much by it; Becauſe, notwithſtanding this decree, *it was far from being acknowledged by the Univerſal Church*. Which I prove from hence, That the *Sardican Canons* were not received by the *Church*: Nothing can be more evident, than that theſe *Canons* were not ſo much as known by the *African Biſhops*, when Pope *Zoſimus* fraudulently ſent them under the name of the *Nicene Canons*; inſomuch that *Cuſanus* queſtions, Whether ever any ſuch thing were determined by the *Sardican Synod* or no: And it appears by S. *Auſtin*, that the *Council* of *Sardica* was of no great credit in *Africa*; for when *Fortunius* the *Donatiſt-Biſhop* would prove that the *Sardican Synod* had written to ſome of their party, becauſe one *Donatus* was mentioned in it; S. *Auſtin* tells him, It was a *Synod* of *Arrians*; by which it ſeems very improbable, that they had ever received the decrees of the *Weſtern*, but only of the *Eaſtern* part of it, which adjourned to *Philippopolis*. Neither was this ever acknowledged for an *Oecumenical Council*, for although it was intended for *ſuch* by the *Emperours*, *Conſtans*, and *Conſtantius*, yet but 70. of the *Eaſtern Biſhops* appeared to 300 of the *Weſtern*; and thoſe *Eaſtern Biſhops* ſoon withdrew from the other, and decreed things directly contrary to the other. So that *Balſamon* and *Zonaras*, as well as the elder *Greeks*, ſay, The decrees of it can at moſt only bind the *Weſtern Churches*; and the arrogating of this power of reviewing cauſes decided by the *Eaſtern Churches* by *Weſtern Biſhops*, was apparently the cauſe of the *diviſions* between them: the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches being after this divided by the *Alpes Succi.e* between *Illyricum* and *Thracia*. And, although *Hilary* and *Epiphanius* expreſly call this a *Weſtern Council*, yet it was a long time, before the *Canons* of it were received in the *Weſtern Church*. Which

Concord. Catholi. l. 2. c. 15.

Aug. ep. 163.

Contra Creſc. l. 3. c. 34. l. 4. c. 44.

is

is ſuppoſed to be the reaſon, Why *Zoſimus* would not mention the *Sardican*, but called them the *Nicene Canons*; which *forgery* was ſufficiently detected by the *African Biſhops*. And it is the worſt of all excuſes, to lay the blame of it (as you do) on the *Pope's Secretary*; for, Do you think *Pope Zoſimus* was ſo careleſs of his buſineſs, as not to look over the *Commonitorium*, which *Fauſtinus* carried with him? Do you thing *Fauſtinus* would not have corrected the fault when the *African Biſhops* boggled ſo at it? What made him ſo unwilling that they ſhould ſend into the *Eaſt* to examine the *Nicene Canons, but intreated them to leave the buſineſs wholly with the Pope*, if he were not conſcious of ſome forgery in the buſineſs? But, you ſay, as a
P. 195. further plea in *Zoſimus* his excuſe, *That the Council of* Sardica *was an Appendix to the Nicene Council rather than otherwiſe*. An excellent *Appendix*, made at two and twenty years diſtance from the other, and called by other *Emperours*, conſiſting of many other perſons, and aſſembled upon a quite different occaſion. If this had been an *Appendix* to the *Nicene Council*, How comes that to have but twenty *Canons*? How came *Atticus* and *Cyrillus* not to ſend theſe with the other? How come all the Copies of *Councils* and *Canons* to diſtinguiſh them? How came they not to be contained in the *Code* of *Canons*, produced in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, in the cauſe of *Baſſianus* and *Stephanus*? If this were the ſame Council, becauſe ſome of the ſame things were determined, How comes that in *Trullo* not to be the ſame with the 6 *Oecumenical*? How comes the *Council* of *Antioch* not to be an *Appendix* to the *Council* of *Nice*, if this was; when it was celebrated before this, and the *Canons* of it inſerted in the *Code* of *Canons* owned by the *Council of Chalcedon*? So that by all the ſhifts and arts you can uſe, you cannot excuſe *Zoſimus* from *Impoſture* in ſending theſe *Sardican* under the name of the *Nicene Canons*. And, on what account the *Pope* falſified the Canons then, is apparent enough, *viz.* for the advancing the *Intereſt* of his *See*; and this the *African Fathers* did as eaſily diſcern afterwards, as we do now. But by this we ſee, What good *Foundations* the *Pope*'s claim of *Supremacy* had then, and what *arts* (not to ſay *frauds*) they were beholding to for ſetting it up, even as *great* as they have ſince made uſe of to maintain it.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Title of Universal Bishop.

In what sense the Title of Universal Bishop was taken in Antiquity. A three fold acceptation of it; as importing 1. *A general care over the Christian Churches, which is attributed to other Catholick Bishops by Antiquity, besides the Bishop of* Rome, *as is largely proved.* 2. *A peculiar dignity over the Churches within the Roman Empire. This accounted then Oecumenical, thence the Bishops of the seat of the Empire called Oecumenical Bishops: and sometimes of other Patriarchal Churches.* 3. *Noting Universal Jurisdiction over the whole Church as Head of it, so never given in Antiquity to the Bishop of* Rome. *The ground of the Contest about this Title between the Bishops of* Rome *and* Constantinople. *Of the proceedings of the Council of* Chalcedon, *about the Popes Supremacy. Of the Grammatical and Metaphorical sense of this Title. Many arguments to prove it impossible that S.* Gregory *should understand it in the Grammatical sense. The great absurdities consequent upon it. S.* Gregory's *Reasons proved to hold against that sense of it which is admitted in the Church of* Rome. *Of* Irenæus *his opposition to* Victor. Victor's *excommunicating the* Asian *Bishops, argues no authority he had over them. What the more powerful principality in* Irenæus *is.* Ruffinus *his Interpretation of the* 6. *Nicene Canon vindicated. The Suburbicary Churches cannot be understood of all the Churches in the Roman Empire. The Pope no Infallible Successour of S.* Peter, *nor so acknowledged to be by* Epiphanius. *S.* Peter *had no Supremacy of Power over the Apostles.*

§. 1. HIs Lordship having undertaken to give an account, How the *Popes* rose by degrees to their *Greatness* under the *Christian Emperours*; in prosecution of that, necessarily falls upon the Title of *Universal Bishop* affected by *John* the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, and condemned by *Pelagius* 2. and *Gregory* 1. This you call *a trite and beaten way*, because I suppose the truth is so plain and evident in it; but withall, you tell us, *This Objection hath been satisfied a hundred times over*; if you had said, the same Answer had been repeated so often over, you had said true; but if you say, that it hath been *satisfied once*, you say more than you are able to defend, as will evidently appear by your very unsatisfactory Answer, which at last you give to it. So that if none of your party have been any wiser than your self in this matter; I am so far from being *satisfied* with what they say, that I can only pity those persons, whose interest swayes their understandings so much (or at least their expressions) as to make them say any thing that seems to be for their purpose, though in it self never so senseless or unreasonable. And I can scarce hold my self from saying with the *Orator*, when a like Objection to this was offered him, because multitudes had said so, *Quasi verò quidquam sit tam valdè, quàm nihil sapere, vulgare*, That truth and reason are the greatest *Novelties* in the world. For seriously, Were it possible for men of common understanding, to rest satisfied with such pitiful shifts as you are fain to make, if they would but use any freedom in enquiring, and any liberty of judging when they had done? But when once men have given (not to say sold away) the exercise of their free reason, by addicting themselves to a particular interest, there can scarce any thing be imagined so absurd, but it passeth currently from one to another, because they are bound to receive all blindfold, and in the same manner to deliver it to others. By which means it is an easie matter, for the greatest nonsense and

con-

contradictions *to be said a hundred times over.* And, Whether it be not so in the present case, is that we are now to enquire into. And for the same ends which you propose to your self, *viz. that all obscurity may be taken away, and the truth clearly appear*; I shall in the first place set down, What his Lordship saith, and then distinctly examine What you reply in Answer to it. Thus then his Lordship proceeds. *About this time brake out the ambition*
P. 178. *of* John Patriarch *of* Constantinople, *affecting to be Universal Bishop. He was countenanced in this by* Mauricius *the Emperour, but sowrely opposed by* Pelagius, *and S.* Gregory: *Insomuch that S* Gregory *plainly sayes, That this Pride*
l. 4. ep. 78. *of his shews that the times of Antichrist were near. So as yet (and this was near upon the point of six hundred years after Christ) there was no Universal Bishop: no one Monarch over the whole Militant Church. But* Mauricius *being deposed and murthered by* Phocas; Phocas *conferred upon* Boniface *the third, that very Honour which two of his predecessors had declaimed against as monstrous and blasphemous, if not Antichristian. Where, by the way, either these two Popes,* Pelagius *and S.* Gregory *erred in this weighty business, about an Universal Bishop over the whole Church: Or, if they did not erre,* Boniface *and the rest, which after him took it upon them, were in their very predecessors judgement Antichristian.* Before you come to a particular Answer, you think it
P. 196. n. 1, 2. necessary to make a way for it, by premising two things. 1. *That the Title of Universal Bishop, was anciently attributed to the Bishops of* Rome; *but they never made use of it.* 2. *That the ancient Bishops of* Constantinople *never intended by this usurped Title, to deny the Popes Universal Authority, even over themselves.* These two things I shall therefore consider, because they tend much to the clearing the main Controversie. I begin therefore with the *Title of Universal Bishop* attributed to the *Bishop* of *Rome*; and before I answer your particular allegations, we must more fully consider, in what sense that title of *Universal Bishops* was taken in *Antiquity*, and in what manner it was attributed to him. For when *titles* have different senses, and those senses evidently made use of by the ancient Writers, it is a most unreasonable thing meerly from the title to inferr one determinate sense, which is the most contrary to the current of *Antiquity*. The title then of *Universal Bishop*, may be conceived to import one of these three things. 1. *A general care and solicitude over all the Churches of the Christian world.* 2. *A peculiar dignity over the Churches within the Empire.* 3. *Universal Jurisdiction over all Churches*, so that all exercise of it in the Church is derivative from him as *Universal Pastor and Head of the Church.* This last is that which you attribute to the *Pope*; and though you find the name of *Universal Bishop a hundred times over*, in the records of the *Church*, yet if it be taken in either of the two former senses, it makes nothing at all to your purpose. Our business is therefore now, to shew, that this title was used in the Church in the two former senses; and that nothing from hence can be inferred for that *Oecumenical Pastorship*, which you say, doth, of Divine Right, belong to the *Bishop* of *Rome.*

§. 2. I begin with the *first*, as this Title may import *a general care and solicitude over all the Christian Churches*: and I deny not but in this sense this title might be attributed in *Antiquity* to the *Bishop* of *Rome*; but then I assert, that nothing peculiar to him can be inferred from hence, because expressions importing the same care, are attributed to other *Bishops*, especially such who were placed in the greater *Sees*, or were active in promoting the *Churches* interest. For which we must consider, that power and authority in the *Bishops* of the *Church*, is given with an immediate respect to the good of the *whole Church*; so that if it were possible that every particular *Bishop* could take care of the *whole Church*, they have authority enough by their *Function* to do it. But it not only being impossible that every *Bishop* should do it, but it being inconsistent with peace and order, that all should undertake it; therefore it was necessary

necessary that there should be some restraints and bounds set, for the more convenient management of that authority which they had. From hence came the *Original* of particular *Dioceses*, that within such a compass they might better exercise that power which they enjoyed. As if many lights be placed in a great Room, though the intention of every one of these is to give light to the *whole Rome*; yet that this might the better be done, these lights are conveniently placed in the several parts of it. And this is that which S. *Cyprian* means in that famous expression of his, *That there is but one Bishoprick in the whole world, a part of which is held by every Bishop*; For the *Church* in common is designed as the Diocese of all *Bishops*, which is set out into several *appartiments* for the more advantagious governing of it. As a flock of many thousand sheep, being committed to the care of many Shepherds, these all have an eye to the good of the *whole Flock*, but do not therefore sit all together in one place to over-see it, but every one hath his share to look after, for the benefit of the *Whole*: But yet so, that upon occasion, one of them may extend his care beyond his own division, and may be very useful for the whole, by counsel and direction. Thus we shall find it was in the *Primitive Church*; though every *Bishop* had his particular *Charge*, yet still they regarded the common good of the whole Church, and upon occasion did extend their counsel and advice far beyond their particular *Churches*; and exercised their Functions in other places besides those, which the *Churches* convenience had allotted to them. Hence it was, that dissentions arising between the *Asian* and *Roman Churches*, *Polycarp* comes to *Rome*, and there, as *Eusebius* from *Irenæus* tells us, He exercised with *Anicetus* his consent, his Episcopal Function. For, as *Valesius* observes, it cannot be understood, as *Franciscus Florens* would have it, of his *receiving the Eucharist from Anicetus*, but something of *honour* is implied in the word παρεχώρησεν, whereas there was nothing but what was common in the other. Hence the several Epistles of *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Irenæus*, and others, for the advising, confirming, and setling *Churches*. Hence *Irenæus* concerned himself so much in the business between *Victor* and the *Asian Churches*, either to prevent, or repeal his sentence of Excommunication against them. Hence S. *Cyprian* writes into *Spain* about the deposing *Basilides* and *Martialis*, two Apostatizing Bishops, and checks *Stephen Bishop* of *Rome*, for his inconsiderate restoring them. Hence, *Faustus* Bishop of *Lyons* writes to S. *Cyprian*, in the case of *Martianus* of *Arles*, and he writes to *Stephen* as being nearer, and more concerned in the business of *Novatianism* (for the honour of his predecessors) in order to his Deposition; yet so, as he looks on it as a common cause belonging to them all (*cui rei nostrum est consulere & subvenire, frater charissime*) *in which they were all bound to advise and help.* Hence S. *Cyprian* writes to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as his *Brother* and *Colleague*, without the least intimation of deriving any Jurisdiction from him, but often expressing *that charge which was committed to every Bishop, which he must look to as mindful of the account he must give to God.* Hence *Nazianzen* saith of S. *Cyprian*, *That he not only governed the Churches of* Carthage *and* Africa, *but all the Western parts, and even almost all the Eastern, Southern, and Northern too, as far as his fame went.* Hence *Arsenius* writes to *Athanasius*, *We embrace Peace and Unity with the Catholick Church, over which thou, through the Grace of God, dost preside.* Hence *Gregory Nazianzen* saith of *Athanasius*, *That he made Laws for the whole earth.* Hence S. *Basil* writes to him, *That he had care of all the Churches, as of his own*; and in the same Epistle calls him, *The Head and chief over all.* Hence S. *Chrysostom* in the praise of *Eustathius* the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, saith, *That he was instructed by the Divine Spirit, that he was not only to have care of that Church over which he was set, but of the whole Church throughout the world.* Hence came

Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. Not. in l.

Euseb. l. 4. c. 25.

Cyprian. ep. 68.

Cypr. ep. 67.

Nazian. Orat. 18. p. 281.

Athanas. Ap. ad Imp. Const. p. 786. Tom. 1. Nazianz. Orat. 21. p. 392. Basil. ep. 52. Tom. 3. p. 79. Chrysost. Tom. 5. p. 631. ed. Savil.

Hieron ep. 71. Basil. l. 11. c. 27, 30, 31. the great endeavours of *Theophilus* and *Cyril*, *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria*, of *Eusebius Vercellensis*, *Hilarius Pictavensis*, and several others, for rooting out of Heresies; not confining themselves to those *Provinces* allotted to them, but extending their care over other *Churches*. Hence came frequent ordinations of persons out of their own *Dioceses*, as of *Paulinus* at *Antioch* by *Lucifer Caralitanus*, of many *Bishops* in *Syria* and *Mesopotamia* by *Eusebius Samosatenus*; and of a *Presbyter* at *Bethleem* by *Epiphanius*; who when he was quarrelled at by *John* of *Hierusalem* for it, he defends his action by this saying, That, *In Sacerdotio Dei nulla est diversitas, i. e.* whereever a *Bishop* was, he might exercise his power as such, although the *Churches* prudence had set limits to their ordinary Jurisdiction. From these things then we see, that a general *care* and *solicitude* of the *Universal Church*, doth belong to every *Bishop*, and that some of them have been expresly said to have had the care of the *whole Church*, which in other terms is to say, *They were Universal Bishops*. So that from this sense of the Title, you gain nothing to your purpose, though the care of the *Universal Church* be attributed to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, though he acts and calls *Councils*, and *orders* other things out of his own *Province*, yet all this proves not the *Supremacy* you intend; for this is no more than other *Bishops* did, whom you will not acknowledge to be *Heads* of the *Church*, or *Universal Bishops* in that sense.

Hieron ep. 60.

§. 3. 2. An *Universal Bishop* denotes *a peculiar dignity over the Churches within the Roman Empire*: For which, two things will be sufficient to manifest it. 1. That the *Roman Empire* was then accounted *Universal*. 2. That *some Bishops in the Great Churches*, were on that account called *Oecumenical or Universal Bishops*. 1. That the *Roman Empire* was then accounted *Universal*; for which multitudes of testimonies might be cited, in which *orbis Romanus*, and *orbis humanus* were looked on as *Synonymous*; thence *Trebellius Pollio* in *Macrianus*, *qui ex diversis partibus orbis Romani restituant*: and as *Salmasius* witnesseth in those writers of the *Imperial History*; most of the ancient *MSS.* for *orbis Romanus* have *orbis humanus*; for, as he saith, *Eâ gloriâ fuerunt Romani, ut totum orbem suum vocarent*; *hinc orbis Romanus passim apud auctores reperitur pro universo orbe*; thence they called the *Roman people*, *omnium gentium victorem*; and from hence *Ammianus Marcellinus* calls *Rome*, *caput mundi* (the head of the world) and the *Roman Senate*, *Asylum mundi totius* (the Sanctuary for the whole world;) thence *Spartianus* saith of *Severus*, *orbem terrarum Romamque despexit*, when, as *Casaubon* observes, he speaks only of the *Roman Provinces*. And from hence, whatever was out of the *Roman Empire*, was called *Barbaria*, thence the *rura vicina Barbariæ* in *Lampridius*, for the *Marches* which lay next to the enemies Country; thence *Marcellinus*, *visus est in Barbarico miles*, and in the *Imperial Constitutions*, as *Justellus* observes, *Barbari vocantur*, *quicunque Imperio Romano non parebant* (all were called barbarous out of the *Roman Empire*) and in the same sense *barbaricum* is used in the 58. *Canon* of the *African Code*, and in the 206. *Canon* of the *Code of the Universal Church*, that the Bishops ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς, *i. e. out of the Roman Empire*, should be ordained by the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*. Now, since the *Roman Empire* was called *orbis Romanus*, and in Greek, ἡ οἰκουμένη, (as appears, in that *Augustus*, *Luk.* 2. 1. is said to tax πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, *the whole world*, which could be only the *Roman Empire*; and the famine in the same, is said to be ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, *Act.* 11. 28.) it is no wonder if those *Bishops* who enjoyed the greatest dignity in the *Roman Empire* were called *Oecumenical*; and those *Councils* so too, which consisted of the *Bishops* within those bounds. I come therefore to the second thing, That *some Bishops* in the *Great Churches* in the *Roman Empire*, were called *Oecumenical*, as that relates to *the* ἡ οἰκουμένη, *viz.* the *Roman Empire*. For which we may consider, the primary

Not. in Hist. August. p. 306.

Amm. Marcel. l. 14. l. 16.

Spartian. in Severo.

Lamprid. in Alex. Sev. Marcel. l. 18. Justel. Not. in Cod. Afric. Can. 58.

Cod. Eccles. Uni. Can. 206. & ibi Justel.

primary ground of the advancement of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, was the *greatness of the City*, as is undeniably manifest by the proceedings of the *Councils* of *Constantinople*, and *Chalcedon* about him; wherein it was decreed, since that was *New-Rome*, that it should enjoy *equal priviledges with the old*. And in all probability the ground of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople's* usurping the title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* was but to correspond with the *greatness* of his *City*, which at the time of the contest between *Pope Gregory*, and him, was in a better condition than *Rome* it self; being the seat of the *Empire*, and therefore he thought it suitable thereto, to be called *Oecumenical Patriarch*. But besides this peculiarity of *Constantinople*, it was no unusual thing for the *Bishop* of the *Patriarchal Churches*, to have expressions given them, tantamount to the title of *Universal Bishop* in any sense but that of the *Universal Jurisdiction*; which I shall prove as to the *three Patriarchs* of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Constantinople*. First, Of *Alexandria*: So *Greg. Nazianzen* saith of *Athanasius*, being made Bishop there, *he had the Government of that people committed to him, which is as much as to say, of the whole world*; *and* John *of* Hierusalem, writing to *Theophilus Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, saith, *That he had the care of all the Churches*. And St. *Basil* writes to *Athanasius* about the establishing of *Meletius* as *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, *that so he might govern as it were the whole body of the Church*. But most clear and full to that purpose is the testimony of *Theodoret* concerning *Nestorius* being made *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*. *He was intrusted with the Government of the Catholick Church of the Orthodox at* Constantinople, *and thereby of the whole world*. What work would you make with so illustrious a testimony in *Antiquity* for the *Bishop of Rome* as this is for the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*? Use therefore and interpret but these testimonies as kindly as you do any for the *Roman See*, and will you not find as large a power over the *Church* attributed to the other *Patriarchs* as you do to the *Bishop* of *Rome*? What is it then you would infer from the title of *Universal Bishop* being attributed to him? Will the very title do more than what is signified by it? Or must it of necessity import something more when given to the *Bishop* of *Rome* than it doth when given to other *Bishops*? if it doth, you must prove it from some other Arguments, and not barely from the title being attributed to them. Thus you see, though the title were granted to be attributed to him, there is nothing new, nothing peculiar in it.

Τὴν τῶ λαῶ προεδρείαν πιστεύθαι, ταὐτὸν ἦ εἰπεῖν ἦ οἰκουμένης πάσης ἐπισκοπίαν. Nazianzen. 21. p. 377.

Tu quidem ut homo Dei & Apostolicâ ornatus gratiâ curam omnium Ecclesiarum sustines. Apud Hieronym. ad Pammach. To. 2. ep. 61. c. 15.

Καὶ τὸ τῆ πάντ' ὡς εἰπεῖν, σώματ' ἦ ἐκκλησίας αὐτὸν προσάναι. Basil. ep. 50.

Τῆς κ' Κωνσταντινούπολιν τῆ ὀρθοδόξων καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἦ προεδρείαν πιστεύθη, εἶδεν ἦ ἦθλον καὶ ἦ οἰκουμένης ἅπασης. Theodoret. hæret. fabul. l. 4. c. 12. p. 245. To. 4. oper.

But we must further examine, Who they are that attribute this title to him, and what the account is of their doing it. For this, you cite *the Council of* Chalcedon *in a letter inserted in the Acts of it*, *the Council of* Constantinople sub Menna, John *Bishop of* Nicopolis, Constantinus Pogonatus *the Emperour*, Basil *the younger*, *and* Balsamon *himself*. To the first I Answer. 1. That this title was not given by the *Council of Chalcedon*. 2. If it had, no more was given to the *Bishop of Rome*, than to the *Bishops* of other *Patriarchal Churches*. 1. That this title was not given by the *General Council of Chalcedon*; this I know *Gregory* 1. in his *Epistles* about this subject repeats *usque ad nauseam*, *that the title of Universal Bishop was offered to the Bishop of* Rome *by the Council of* Chalcedon *and that he refused it*; but there is as little evidence for the one as the other. That the title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* was attributed to the *Bishop* of *Rome* by some Papers read and received in that *Council* I deny not, but we must consider the §. 4. P. 196.

persons who did it, and the occasion of it. The persons were such who came to inform the *Council* against *Dioscorus* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and they were no other than *Athanasius* a Presbyter, *Theodorus* and *Ischyrion* two *Deacons*, and *Sophronius* a *Laick* of *Alexandria*: now these persons not in a letter (as you relate it) but in their *bills* exhibited to the *Council* against *Dioscorus* give that title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* or *Archbishop* to *Leo* the *Bishop* of *Rome*. And is this now the offer made of the title of *Universal Bishop* by the *Council of Chalcedon?* But you say, *This was inserted into the Acts of the Council?* I grant it was, but on what account? not with any respect to the *title*, but as containing the *Accusations* against *Dioscorus*. But where do any of the *Bishops* of that *Council* attribute that title to *Leo?* which of them mentions it in their subscriptions to the Deposition of *Dioscorus*, though many of them speak expressly of *Leo* and *Anatolius* together with the same titles of honour to them both? Why did not the *Council* superscribe their *Synodical Epistle* to *Pope Leo* with that title? so indeed *Binius* rather supposes they should have done, than proves they ever did it: and that only from *Gregories* Epistle (not *Leo*'s as he mistakes it) to *Eulogius* where he mentions this offer, but upon what grounds we have seen already. But suppose, 2. We should grant, that the *Council of Chalcedon* should have offered the title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* or *Bishop*, to the *Bishop of Rome*; there are none who understand any thing of the nature of that title, or the proceedings of that *Council*, who can imagine they should intend any acknowledgement of the *Popes Supremacy* by it. For the title it self as to the importance of it was common to other *Bishops*, especially of the *Patriarchal Sees*, as I have proved by some instances already, and might do yet by more; but I shall content my self with the ingenuous confession of *Sim. Vigorius*; *That when the Western Fathers, call the* Roman *Bishops, Bishops of the Universal Church, they do it from the custom of their Churches, not that they look on them as Universal Bishops of the whole Church, but in the same sense that the Patriarchs of* Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, *are called so; or as they are Universal over the Churches under their Patriarchate; or that in Oecumenical Councils they preside over the whole Church.* And after acknowledgeth, that the title of *Universal* or *Oecumenical Bishop* makes nothing for the *Popes Monarchy* in the *Church*. And if it doth not so when given by the *Western Fathers*, much less certainly when given by the *Eastern*, especially those who met in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*; For it is evident by their 16 *Session*, the 28 *Canon*, and their *Synodical Epistle* to *Pope Leo*, they designed the advancement of the *See* of *Constantinople* to *equal priviledges with that of* Rome. And therefore if they gave the *Pope* the title of *Oecumenical Patriarch*, or *Bishop*, it was that he might be willing that the *Patriarch of Constantinople* might be called so too. And if, as *Gregory* saith, the *Bishops of* Rome *would not accept the title of Universal Bishop*, the truest account I know of it, is, lest the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* should share with him in it; but we see when the great *Benefactor* to your *Church* the *Benign Phocas*, as *Gregory* himself styles him, gave it to the *Bishop* of *Rome alone*, then *hands* and *heart* and all were ready to receive it. And I much fear *Leo* 1. and St. *Gregory* himself would have been shrewdly tempted to receive it, if it had been offered them upon those terms, that no one else should have it besides them; but they scorned it till they could have it alone. And for all their declamations against the *pride* of *Anatolius* and *John*, *Patriarchs* of *Constantinople*, they must look very favourably on the actions

Concil. Chalced. Act. 3. part. 3. p. 243.

Bin. not. in Chalced. Con. Tom. 3. Concil. p. 562.

Et harum rerum ignari Andabatæ nostri, non advertunt, cum Occidentales Patres, Pontifices Romanos vocant, universales Ecclesiæ Episcopos, id more suarum Ecclesiarum facere, & eâ notione, non quod putent totius orbis universalis, universales esse Episcopos, sed eâdem quâ Constantinopolitanus, Alexandrinus, Antiochenus, Hierosolymitanus, dicuntur universales: aut ut universales Ecclesiarum quæ sunt sub eorum Patriarchatu: aut quod in Concilius Oecumenicis toti Ecclesiæ præsint. Vigorius Comment. ad Resp. Synodal. Concil. Basil. p. 36.

actions of those two *Popes*, that discern not their own *Pride* in condemning of them for it. For usually men shew it as much in suspecting or condemning others for it, as in any other way whatsoever. Thus it was in these persons; they thought the *Patriarchs* of *Constantinople* proud and arrogant, because they sought to be equal with them. But, Was it not their own greater *Pride*, that they were able to bear no *equals?* and it is to be feared, it was their desire to advance their own *Supremacy* which made them quarrel so much with *Anatolius*, and *John*, and *Cyriacus*. For would they but have been contented to truckle under the *Roman Bishops* they had been accounted very meek and humble men. And St. *Gregory* himself, would not sure have thought much to have called them so, who most abominably flatters that monster *Phocas*, after the murder of *Mauricius* and his *Children*: for he begins his *Epistle* to him with, *Gloria in excelsis Deo: Glory to God on high, who, according to what is written, changes times and transfers Kingdoms:* and after, in such notorious flattering expressions congratulates his coming to the *Throne*, that any one who reads them would think *Phocas* the *greater Saint*; he rejoyces, *that the benignity of his piety was advanced to the Imperial Throne, nay* (lætentur cœli & exultet terra) *let the heavens rejoyce and the earth be glad, and all the people which hath been hitherto in much affliction, revive at the benignity of your actions.* O rare *Phocas!* Could he do any less than pronounce the *Bishop* of *Rome Universal Bishop* after this, when poor *Cyriacus* at *Constantinople* suffered for his opposing him for the execrable murder of his *Master?* Therefore these proceedings of *Leo* and *Gregory* yield shrewd matter of suspicion, what the main ground of their quarrel against the *Patriarchs* of *Constantinople* was. For before, the *Emperors* stood up for the honour of *Constantinople* as being the *seat* of their *Empire*, and *Rome* began to sink, the *Empire* decaying there; but now, there was a fit time to do something for the *honour* of the *Roman See*; *Cyriacus* was in disgrace with the *Tyrant Phocas*; and no such time as now to fall in with him and caress him: and we see *Gregory* did it pretty well for a *Saint*, but he lived not to enjoy the benefit of it; but *Boniface* did however.

Greg. l. 11. ep. 36. Ind. 6.

§. 5. After the *Patriarchate* of *Constantinople* was erected, the *Popes* had a double game to play, to advance themselves, and depress that, which it was very hard for them to do, because all the *Eastern Bishops*, as well as the *Emperour* favoured it. But after *equal priviledges* were decreed to the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* with the *Bishop* of *Rome*, by the *Council* of *Constantinople*, they could no longer dissemble their choler; but had no such occasion ministred to them to express it as after the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, (wherein were present 630 *Bishops*) which confirmed the former. For then *Leo* fumes and frets and writes to *Martianus*, and *Pulcheria*, to *Anatolius* and the *Bishops* of the *East*; but still pretends that he stood up for the *priviledges* of the other *Patriarchs* and the *Nicene Canons*, and what not? but one might easily discern what it was that pinched him, *viz.* the *equalling* the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* with himself. Which it is apparent he suspected before, by the instructions he gave his *Legats Paschasinus* and *Lucentius*, to be sure to oppose whatever was proposed in the *Council.* concerning the *Primacy* of that *See*. And accordingly they did; and complained that the *Canon* was *surreptitiously* made. Which they were hugely overseen in doing while the *Council* sat, for upon this the whole matter is reviewed, the *Judges* scan the business, the *Bishops* protest there were no practices used; that they all voluntarily consented to it; and all this in the presence of the *Roman Legats?* How comes it then to pass that this should not be a regular and Conciliar action? Were not the Bishops at age to understand their own *priviledges?* Did not

not the Biſhop of *Antioch* know his own *intereſt* as well as *Pope Leo?* Muſt he be ſuppoſed more able to underſtand the *Nicene Canons* than theſe 630 Biſhops? Why then was not this *Canon* as *regular* as any other. Why forſooth, *The Pope did not conſent to it.* So true is that ſharp cenſure of *Ludovicus Vives*, that, *thoſe are accounted lawful Canons and Councils which make for their intereſt, but others are no more eſteemed than a company of tattling Goſſips.* But what made the *Pope* ſo angry at this *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon?* He pretends the honour of the *Nicene Canons*, the preſerving the *priviledges* of other *Patriarchs*; But *Binius* hath told us the true reaſon of it; *becauſe, they ſay, that the Primacy of* Rome *came, by its being the ſeat of the Empire; and therefore not by Divine right: and ſince* Conſtantinople *was become the ſeat of the Empire too, therefore the Patriarch there ſhould enjoy equal priviledges with the Biſhop of* Rome. If *Rome* had continued ſtill the ſole *ſeat* of the *Empire*, this reaſon would not have been quarrelled at; but now *Rome* ſinking and *Conſtantinople* riſing, this muſt not be endured; but all the arts and devices poſſible muſt be uſed to keep it under. And this is the true account of the *pique* which the Biſhops of *Rome* had to the *Patriarchs* of *Conſtantinople*: From whence we may eaſily gueſs how probable it is that this *Council* of *Chalcedon* did acknowledge the *Pope Oecumenical Biſhop* in any other ſenſe than they contended the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* was ſo too. And the ſame anſwer will ſerve for all your following Inſtances. For, as you pretend that the *Council of Conſtantinople* ſub Menna *did call Pope* Agapetus *Oecumenical Patriarch*, ſo it is moſt certain that it call'd *Mennas* the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* ſo too. And which is more, *Adrian* I. in his Epiſtle to *Tharaſius* of *Conſtantinople* in the ſecond *Nicene Council* calls him *Univerſal Biſhop.* If therefore the *Greek Emperors* and *Balſamon* call the *Pope* ſo, they import nothing peculiar to him in it, becauſe it is moſt evident they call'd their own *Patriarch* ſo likewiſe. So that you find little advantage to your cauſe from this firſt thing which you premiſe, *viz.* that the *Pope* was anciently called *Univerſal Biſhop.* But you ſay further. 2. *That the Biſhops of* Conſtantinople *never intended to deny by this uſurped title, the Popes Univerſal Authority even over themſelves.* This is ambiguous, unleſs it be further explained what you mean by *Univerſal Authority*; for, it may either note ſome kind of *præ-eminence* and *dignity* which the Biſhop of *Rome* had as the *chief Patriarch*, and who on that account had great *Authority* in the *Church*, and this your inſtances prove that the *Patriarchs* of *Conſtantinople* did acknowledge to belong to the *Pope*: but if by *Univerſal Authority* be meant *Univerſal Juriſdiction over the Church as appointed the head of it by Chriſt*, then not one of your inſtances comes near the ſhadow of a proof for it.

Itaque illa demum ejs videntur edicta & concilia quæ in rem ſuam faciunt, reliqua non pluris æſtimanda quam conventum muliercularum in textrinâ vel thermis. Lud. Vives in Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 20. cap. 26.

Bin. not. in Chalced. Con. p. 561.

P. 196. n. 2.

§. 6.

P. 197. n. 3. Thus having conſidered what you premiſe, we come to your Anſwer it ſelf. For which you tell us, *We are to take notice, that the term* [*Univerſal Biſhop*] *is capable of two ſenſes; the one Grammatical, the other Metaphorical. In the Grammatical ſenſe it ſignifies Biſhop of the Univerſal Church, and of all Churches in particular, even to the excluſion of all others from being properly Biſhops; and conſequently diſplaceable at his pleaſure; as being only his, not Chriſts officers; and receiving authority from him, and not from Chriſt. In the Metaphorical ſenſe, it ſignifies only ſo high and eminent a dignity above all other Biſhops throughout the whole Church, that though he, who is ſtiled Univerſal Biſhop, hath a true and real Superintendency, Juriſdiction, and Authority over all other Biſhops, yet that they be as truly and properly Biſhops in their reſpective Provinces and Dioceſes as he himſelf. This being cleared* (ſay you) *'tis evident that St.* Gregory *when he inveighs againſt the title of Univerſal*

N. 4.

verſal Biſhop, takes it in the literal and Grammatical ſenſe; which you very faintly endeavour to prove out of him, as I ſhall make it preſently appear. This being then the ſubſtance of that Anſwer which you ſay hath been given *a hundred times over*, muſt now *once* for all paſs a ſtrict and ſevere examination. Which it ſhall receive in theſe two Enquiries, 1. Whether it be poſſible to conceive that St. *Gregory* ſhould take *Univerſal Biſhop* in the literal and *Grammatical* ſenſe? 2. Whether all the Arguments which he uſeth againſt that title, do not hold againſt that *Univerſal Juriſdiction* which you attribute to the *Pope* as *Head of the Church?*

1. Whether it be poſſible to conceive that St. *Gregory* ſhould take *Univerſal Biſhop* in the *literal and Grammatical ſenſe* which you give of it? And he which can think ſo, muſt have ſome other way of underſtanding his meaning than by his words and arguments, which I confeſs I do not pretend to. But if we examine them, we ſhall find how impoſſible it is that St. *Gregory* ſhould ever think that *John* pretended to be the ſole Biſhop of this world. 1. Becauſe *Gregory* ſaith, *That ſame title which* John *had uſurped was offered to the* Roman *Biſhops by the Council of* Chalcedon, *but none of them would ever uſe it, becauſe it ſeemed to diminiſh the honour of other Biſhops.* Now I pray think with your ſelf, whether ever 630 Biſhops would conſent together to give away all their power and Authority in the *Church?* For you ſay, *The literal ſenſe of Univerſal Biſhop doth ſuppoſe him to be Biſhop of all particular Churches, to the excluſion of all others from being properly Biſhops, and are all diſplaceable at his pleaſure.* Can it now enter into your mind that *Gregory* ſhould ever think that theſe Biſhops ſhould all make themſelves the *Popes Vaſſals* of their own free choice? We ſee even under the great *Uſurpations* of the Biſhop of *Rome* ſince, though they pretend (for all that I can ſee) to be *Oecumenical Biſhops* in a higher ſenſe than ever *John* pretended to, that yet the Biſhops of the *Roman Communion* are not willing to ſubmit their office wholly to the *Papal Juriſdiction*; witneſs the ſtout and eager conteſts of the *Spaniſh* Biſhops in the *Council* of *Trent* about the *Divine Inſtitution of the Epiſcopal Office*, againſt the pretences of the *Italian* Party. And ſhall we then think when the *Pope* was far from that power which he hath ſince Uſurped, that ſuch a multitude of grave and reſolute Biſhops ſhould throw their *Miters* down at the *Popes feet*, and offer him in your *literal ſenſe*, to be *ſole Biſhop of the World?* That they would relinquiſh their power, which they made no queſtion they had from *Chriſt*, and take it up again at the *Popes hands?* But whether you can imagine this of ſo many Biſhops or no, Can you conceive that *Gregory* ſhould think ſo of them? and he muſt do it, if he took the title of *Univerſal Biſhop* in your *literal ſenſe*; and yet this *Gregory* ſaith, *Hoc Univerſitatis nomen oblatum eſt, That very name of Univerſal Biſhop was offered to the Pope by the Council of* Chalcedon; Sed nullus unquam Deceſſorum meorum hoc tam prophano Vocabulo uti conſenſit. Nothing then can be more plain, than that *John* took that which the *Pope* refuſed. And he that can believe that this title ſhould ever be offered in this literal ſenſe, I deſpair without the help of *Phrſick* to make him believe any thing. 2. This very title was not uſurped wholly by *John* himſelf, but was given him in a *Council* at *Conſtantinople*. This *Gregory* confeſſeth in his Epiſtle to *Eulogius* and *Anaſtaſius* the *Patriarchs* of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, *that about eight years before, in the time of* Pelagius *his predeceſſor*, John *called a Council at* Conſtantinople *in which he endeavours to be called Univerſal Biſhop*; ſo *Gregory*: but he confeſſeth elſewhere that he effected it. And it appears by the Epiſtle of *Pelagius* himſelf writ on that occaſion, that it was more than a *meer endeavour*, and that they did conſent to it; elſe, Why doth *Pelagius* ſay, *Quicquid in veſtro conventiculo ſtatuiſtis*, Whatever they had determined

Greg. ep. l. 4. ep. 32.

Greg. l. 4. ep. 36.

Ibid.

Greg. ep. l. 4. ep. 34.

Pelag. 2. ep. 8. apud Bin. T. 4. Concil.

mined in their Conventicle (as on this account *Pelagius* calls it, because it wanted his approbation)? And it is evident from *Gregories* zealous writing to the other *Patriarchs* about it, that they did not look on themselves as so much concerned about it. Now in this *Council* which met at *Constantinople*, which was called together in the case of *Gregory* the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, all the *Patriarchs* either by themselves or *substitutes* were present, as *Evagrius* tells us, and not only they but several *Metropolitans* too; now if they had taken this in the *literal sense*, Can you think they would have yielded to it? Were not they much more concerned about it than either *Pelagius* or *Gregory* were? for they were near him, and were sure to live under this usurped power of his, and to smart by it, if it were so great as you suppose it to be. But it is apparent by their yielding to it, they looked on it, to be sure, not in the *Literal sense*, and it may be as no more than the *Honorary Title* of *Oecumenical Patriarch.*

Evagr. hist. l. 6. c. 7.

§. 7. 3. How comes it to pass, that none of the *successors* of *John* and *Cyriacus* did ever challenge this Title in the *Literal sense* of it? For we do not see that they quitted it, for all *Phocas* gave it to *Pope Boniface*, since by your own confession in the *Greek Canon-Law*, *Sisinnius*, *German*, *Constantine*, *Alexius*, *and others are called Oecumenical Patriarchs:* And it appears by the Epistles of *Pelagius* and *Gregory*, that was the *Title* which *John* had then given him. *Si summus Patriarcha Universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen cæteris denegatur*, saith *Pelagius*. *Si enim hoc dici licenter permittitur, honor Patriarcharum omnium negatur*, saith *Gregory*. From which words I think it most probable, that the main ambition of the *Patriarchs* of *Constantinople*, was not meerly that they would be called *Oecumenical Patriarchs*, but that Title should properly belong to them as excluding others from it, which was it that touched the *Bishops* of *Rome* to the *quick*; because then *Constantinople* flourished, as much as *Rome* decayed by the oppressions of the *Lombards*; and *Gregory* complained of this to *Constantia* the *Empress*, that for seven and twenty years together they had lived in *Rome*, *inter Longobardorum gladios* (*among the swords of the Lombards*) and this made them so jealous, that the honour of the *Roman See* was then sinking, and therefore they stickle so much against this Title, and draw all the invidious consequences from it possible, the better to set the other *Patriarchs* against it; and because that would not extend far beyond the *Patriarchs* themselves, they pretend likewise, that this was to make himself *Universal Bishop*. But not certainly in your *Literal sense*; for then *Gregory* would have objected some *actions* consequent upon this Title; in depriving *Bishops* of their *Jurisdiction, and displacing some, and putting in others at his pleasure*; which you say, is the natural effect of this *Literal sense* of *Universal Bishop*. But we read of nothing of this nature done either by *John* or *Cyriacus*; they acted no more than they did, only enjoyed a higher Title. And this is proved further,

Ibid.

L. 4. ep. 34.

4. By the carriage of the *Emperour Mauricius* in this business. *Gregory* writes a pitiful moaning Letter to him about it, and uses all the *Rhetorick* he had to perswade the *Emperour*, that he would either *flectere*, or *coercere*, *incline*, *or force him* to lay aside that arrogant Title: But for all this it appears by *Gregory*'s Letter to the *Empress*, *That the Emperor had checked him for medling in it*, and was so far from opposing the *Patriarchs* Title, that in effect *he bid him trouble himself no more about it:* Which poor S. *Gregory* took very ill. And afterwards, when *Cyriacus* succeeded *John* in *Constantinople*, the *Emperour* being somewhat fearful, lest *Gregory* at the coming in of a new *Patriarch*, might, on the account of this new Title, deny his *Communicatory Letters*, he dispatches a *Letter* to him to quicken him about it. And he takes it very unkindly that the *Emperour* should

Tristè mihi aliquid serenissimus Dominus innuit, quòd non tum corripuit qui superbit, sed me magis ab intentione mtâ declinare studuit. Greg. l. 4. ep. 34.

should suspect his *indiscretion* so much, that for the sake of this *Title*, *which* he saith, *had sorely wounded him, he should deny Communion in the Faith with him*; and yet in the same Epistle saith, *That whosoever took the Title of Universal Bishop upon him, was a forerunner of Antichrist.* But if this name had been apprehended in that which you call, *The Literal and Grammatical sense*, Would not the *Emperour* (being commended by *Gregory* too for his *Piety*) have rather encouraged him in it? whereas he plainly tells him, *It was a contest about a frivolous name, and nothing else; and that there ought to be no scandal among them about it.* Upon which *Gregory* is put to his distinctions of two sorts of *frivolous things*, *some that are very harmless, and some that are very hurtful*, i. e. frivolous things are either such as are frivolous, or such as are not; for, Who ever imagined, that such things as are very hurtful, are *frivolous?* But however, S. *Gregory* speaks excellent sense; for his meaning is, that the *Title* it self may be *frivolous*, but the *consequences* of it may be dreadful, and so we have found it since his time. So that this appears to be the true state of the business between them; the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, he challengeth the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* or *Bishop*, as belonging of right to him, being *Patriarch* of the *chief Seat* of the *Empire*, but in the mean time challengeth no *Universal Jurisdiction* by virtue of this Title: On which account the *Emperour* and *Eastern Bishops* admit of it: On the other side, the *Bishops* of *Rome*, partly looking at their own *interest* in it (for so it appears by one of *Gregory*'s Epistles to the *Emperour*, that he suspected it to be his own *interest* which he stood so much up for) and partly foreseeing the dangerous *consequence* of this, if *Universal Jurisdiction* were challenged with it, they resolutely oppose it, not meerly for the *Title* sake, but for that which might follow upon that *Title*, taking it not in your *Literal*, but in your *Metaphorical sense*, as I shall shew presently. But neither party was so weak and silly, as to apprehend it in your *Literal sense*; for then neither would the *Emperour* have sleighted it, nor the *Popes* opposed it on those terms which they do, and on such grounds which reach your *Metaphorical sense*.

Greg. l. 6. ep. 30.

De quâ re mihi in suis jussionibus pietas præcepit dicens, ut pro appellatione frivoli nominis inter nos scandalum generari non debeat. Greg. ibid.

Sed rogo ut imperialis pietas perpendat, quia alia sunt frivola valdè innoxia, alia valdè nociva. Ibid.

Nunquid ego hâc in re piissime Domine propriam causam defendo? nunquid specialem injuriam vindico? Id. l. 4. ep. 32.

5. The *same Title* in the *same sense* which *Gregory* opposed it, did *Boniface* accept of, from the *Emperour Phocas*. This you confess your self, when you say, *That all that* Phocas *did, was but to declare that the Title in contest did of right belong to the Bishop of* Rome *only*; therefore the same Title which the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* took to himself before, was both given by *Phocas*, and taken by *Pope Boniface*. This then being confessed by you, let me now seriously ask you, Whether the *Title* of *Universal Bishop*, which *Pope Gregory* opposed, was to be taken in the *Grammatical* or *Metaphorical sense?* Take now, Whether of them you please; if in the *Metaphorical*, all his arguments hold against the *Popes present Universal Jurisdiction*, by your own confession; if in the *Literal* and *Grammatical*, then *Pope Boniface* had all those things belonging to him, which *Gregory* condemns that Title for. Then by your own confession *Pope Boniface* must be *the forerunner of Antichrist*, he must *equal himself to* Lucifer *in pride*, he must have that *name of Blasphemy* upon him, and all those dreadful *consequences* must attend him and all his followers, who own that Title of *Universal Bishop*, in that which you call the *Literal* or *Grammatical sense* of it.

P. 199. n. 5.

6. Lastly, it appears from S. *Gregory* himself, that the *Reasons* which he urgeth against the Title of *Universal Bishop*, are such as hold against that which you call the *Metaphorical sense* of it; which in short is, *An Universal Pastor exercising Authority and Jurisdiction over the whole Church*. And

it is scarce possible to imagine, that he should speak more clearly against such an *Universal Headship* than he doth; and urges such arguments against it, which properly belong to that *Metaphorical sense* of it. As when he saith to *John* the *Patriarch*, *What wilt thou answer to Christ the Head of the Universal Church in the day of judgement, who dost endeavour to subject all his members to thee, under the name of Universal Bishop?* What is there in these words which doth not fully belong to your *Metaphorical sense of Head of the Church?* Doth he not subject all *Christs members to him?* Doth he not challenge to himself *proper jurisdiction over them?* What then will he be able to answer *to Christ the Head of the Universal Church*, as St. *Gregory* understands it *exclusivè* of any other? Doth not he *arise to that height of singularity, that he is subject to none, but rules over all?* yet these are the very words he uses; and, Can any more expressly describe your *Head of the Church* than these do? Yet herein he saith, *He imitates the Pride of Lucifer*, who, according to St. *Gregory*, endeavoured to be the *Head of the Church Triumphant*, as the *Pope of the Church Militant*. And follows that parallel close, *That an Universal Bishop imitates* Lucifer *in exalting his Throne above the Stars of God: For* (saith he) *What are all the Brethren the Bishops of the Universal Church, but the Stars of Heaven?* and after parallels them with the *Clouds*, and so this *terrestrial Lucifer ascends above the heights of the clouds.* And again, saith he, *Surely the Apostle* Peter, *was the first member* (not the Head) *of the Holy and Universal Church. Paul, Andrew*, and *John, What are they else but the Heads of particular Churches? And yet they are all members of the Church under one Head.* Can any thing be more clear against any *Head* of the *Universal Church, but Christ himself?* When St. *Peter* is acknowledged to be only a *prime member* of the *Church*; How then come his successours to be the *Heads* of it? And, as he goes on, *The Saints before the Law, under the Law, and under Grace, who all make up the body of our Lord, they were all but members of the Church, and none of them would be called Universal.* And, I pray, let his *Holiness* consider his following words, *Let your Holiness acknowledge what pride it is to be called by that name, which none that was truly holy was ever call'd by.* And, Do you think now that these expressions do not as properly reach your *Head of the Church*, as if they had been spoken by a *Protestant* against that Doctrine which you all own? What is there in all this, that implies that others should be *no Bishops*, but only *titular?* yes, they may be as much *Bishops* as you acknowledge them to be, *i. e. as to their power of Order, but not as to their Jurisdiction.* For this, you say and defend, comes from the *Head* of the *Church*; or else your *Monarchical Government* in the *Church* signifies nothing. Do not you make the *Pope Universal Pastor of the Church*, in as high a sense as any of these expressions carry it? And when St. *Gregory* urges so often, *That if there be such an Universal Bishop, if he fails, the Church would fail too*; Do you deny the consequence as to the *Pope?* Doth not *Bellarmine* tell us, when he writes of the *Pope*, he writes *de summâ rei Christianæ, Of the main of all Christianity*, and surely then the *Church* must fail if the *Popes Supremacy* doth? And I pray now consider with your self, Whether this Answer which you say *hath been given a hundred times over*, can satisfie any reasonable man? Nay, Doth it not appear to be so absurd and incongruous, that it is matter of just admiration, that ever it should have been given *once*; and yet you

Tu quid Christo universalis sc. Ecclesiæ expsti, in extremi judicii examine dicturus es, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet conaris universalis appellatione supponere? Greg. l. 4. ep. 38.

Ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut & nulli subesse & solus omnibus præesse videretur. Id. ib.

Quid enim fratres tui omnes universalis Ecclesiæ Episcopi, nisi astra cœli sunt? Ib.

Certè Petrus Apostolus primum membrum sanctæ & universalis Ecclesiæ est. Paulus, Andreas, Johannes, quid aliud quam singulariumsunt plebium capita? Et tamen sub uno capite omnes sunt membra Ecclesiæ. Ibid.

Vestra autem Sanctitas agnoscat, quantum apud se tumeat, quæ illo nomine vocari appetit, quo vocari nullus præsumpsit, qui veraciter sanctus fuit. Ibid.

you are wonderfully displeased that his Lordship should bring this Objection upon the stage again. But, Do you think your Answers, like your *Prayers*, will do you good by being said *so often over?* Indeed therein they are alike, that they are both in an *unknown tongue*. Your *Literal sense* of *Universal Bishop* being in this case no more intelligible than your *Latin Prayers* to a Country Congregation.

§. 3. These things being thus clear, I have prevented my self in the second *Enquiry*, in that I have proved already, that the *Reasons* which St. *Gregory* produceth hold against that sense of *Universal Bishop*, which you own and contend for, as of right belonging to the *Bishop* of *Rome*. Although it were no difficult matter to prove, that, according to the most received Opinion in your *Church, viz. that all Jurisdiction in Bishops is derived from the Pope* (which opinion you cannot but know is most acceptable at *Rome*, and was so at the *Council* of *Trent*) that that which you call the *Literal sense*, doth follow your *Metaphorical*, *i. e.* If the *Pope* hath *Universal Jurisdiction* as *Head* of the *Church*, then other *Bishops* are not properly *Bishops*, nor *Christ's Officers, but his*. For what doth their *power* of *order* signifie as to the *Church* without the *power* of *Jurisdiction?* And therefore, if they be taken only *in partem solicitudinis*, and not *in plenitudinem potestatis*, according to the known distinction of the *Court* of *Rome*, it necessarily follows, that they are but the *Pope's Officers*, and are taken just into so much authority as he commits to them, and no more. And this *Bellarmine* proves from the very *form* of the *Pope's* consecration of *Bishops*, whereby he commits *the power of governing the Church to him, and the administration of it in spirituals and temporals*. And you may see by the speech of *Father Laynez*, in the *Council of Trent*, How stoutly he proves that the *power of Jurisdiction was given wholly to the Bishop of* Rome, *and that none in the Church besides hath any spark of it but from him; that the Bishop of* Rome *is true and absolute Monarch, with full and total power and Jurisdiction, and the Church is subject unto him, as it was to Christ. And, as when his Divine Majesty did govern it, it could not be said that any of the faithful had any the least power or Jurisdiction, but meer, pure, and total subjection; so it must be said in all perpetuity of time, and so understood, that the Church is a Sheepfold and a Kingdom. And, that he is the Only Pastor, is plainly proved by the words of Christ, when he said, He hath other sheep which he will gather together, and so one Sheepfold should be made, and one Shepherd.* What think you now of the *Literal sense* of *Universal Bishop*, for the *Only Bishop?* Are not the *Only Bishop*, and the *Only Pastor* all one? Will not all those words of St. *Gregory* reach this, which any of you make use of to prove, that he takes it in the worst and Literal sense? nay, it goes higher. For *Gregory* only argues, that from the *Title* of *Universal Bishop* he must be *sole Bishop*, and others could not be any *true Bishops*; but here it is asserted in plain terms, that the *Bishop of* Rome *is the only Pastor*, and that as much as if *Christ himself* were here upon earth; and therefore if your *Literal sense* hath any *sense* at all in it, it is much more true of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, than ever it could be of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*. And therefore I pray think more seriously of what he saith, *That to agree in that prophane word, is to lose the Faith*; **That such a blasphemous name should be far from the hearts of Christians, in which by the arrogance of one Bishop, the honour of all is taken away.* Neither will it serve your turn to say (which is all that you have to say) that this is not the *definitive sentence of your Church*, but that many in your *Church* hold otherwise, That there is *power of Jurisdiction properly in Bishops*. For, although these latter are not near the number of the other, nor so much in favour

Bellarm. de Pontif. l. 4. cap. 24. Hist. Concil. Trid. l. 7. p. 611.

Greg. l. 4. ep. 34. l. 7. ep. 69.

Consentire in hoc scelesto vocabulo, est fidem perdere. Greg. l. 4. ep. 39.

* *Absit à cordibus Christianorum nomen istud blasphemiæ, in quo omnium Sacerdotum honor adimitur, dum ab uno sibi denegatur arrogatur.* l. 4. ep. 32.

favour with your *Church*, but are looked on as a *diſcontented party*, as appears by the proceedings in the *Council of Trent*; yet that is not it we are to look after, What all in your *Church* are agreed on, but what the *Pope* challengeth as belonging to *himſelf*. Was not *Father Laynez* his Doctrine highly approv'd at *Rome*, as well as by the *Cardinal Legats* at *Trent*, and all the Italian party? Were not the other party diſcountenanced and diſgraced as much as might be? Doth not the *Pope* arrogate this to himſelf, to be *Oecumenical Paſtor*, and the *ſole Fountain* of all *Juriſdiction* in the *Church*? If ſo, all that ever S. *Gregory* ſaid againſt that *Title*, falls moſt heavily upon the *Pope*. For, S. *Gregory* doth not ſtand upon what others attributed to him, but what he arrogated to himſelf, that therein, *he was the Prince of Pride, the forerunner of Antichriſt, uſing a vain, new, raſh, fooliſh, proud, prophane, erroneous, wicked, hypocritical, ſingular, preſumptuous, blaſphemous Name*. For all theſe goodly *Epithets* doth S. *Gregory* beſtow upon it; and, I believe, if he could have thought of more, and worſe, he would as freely have beſtowed them. If therefore *John* the *Patriarch* was ſaid by him to *tranſgreſs God's Laws, violate the Canons, diſhonour the Church, deſpiſe his Brethren, imitate Lucifer*, How much more doth this belong to him, that not only challengeth to be *Oecumenical Patriarch*, but the *ſole Paſtor* of the *Church*, and that all *Juriſdiction* is derived from him? And by this time I hope you ſee, that the Anſwer you ſay hath been given a *hundred times over*, is ſo pitifully weak, abſurd and ridiculous, that you might have been aſhamed to have produced it *once*, and much more to repeat it without ſaying any more for it than you do. For, your other diſcourſe depends wholly upon it, and all that being taken away, the reſt doth fall to the ground with it.

. Greg. l. 4. ep. 32, 34, 38, 39. l. 6. ep. 2. 24.

§. 10. We muſt now therefore return to his Lordſhips diſcourſe, in which he goes on to give an account of the riſe of the *Pope's Greatneſs*. "As yet, ſaith

P. 179. "he, The right of *Election*, or ratification of the *Pope*, continued in the *Em-*
"*perour*: but then the *Lombards* grew ſo great in *Italy*, and the *Empire* was
"ſo infeſted with *Saracens*, and ſuch changes happened in all parts of the
"world, as that neither for the preſent, the homage of the *Pope* was uſeful
"for the *Emperour*; nor the protection of the *Emperour* available for the
"*Pope*. By this means the *Biſhop* of *Rome* was left to play his own game by
"himſelf. A thing which as it pleaſed him well enough, ſo both he and his
"Succeſſours made great advantage by it. For, being grown to that *Emi-*
"*nence* by the *Emperour*, and the greatneſs of *that City* and place of his aboad;
"he found himſelf the more free, the greater the *Tempeſt* was, that beat up-
"on the other. And then firſt he ſet himſelf to alienate the hearts of the
"*Italians* from the *Emperour*. Next he oppoſed himſelf againſt him. And
"about *A. D.* 710. *Pope Conſtantine* 1. did alſo firſt of all openly confront
"*Philippicus* the *Emperour*, in defence of *Images*; as *Onuphrius* tells us. Af-
"ter him *Gregory* 2. and the 3. did the ſame by *Leo Iſaurus*. By this time
"the *Lombards* began to pinch very cloſe, and to vex on all ſides, not *Italy*
"only, but *Rome* alſo. This drives the *Pope* to ſeek a new *Patron*. And
"very fitly he meets with *Charles Martell* in *France*, that famous warrior
"againſt the *Saracens*. Him he implores in defence of the *Church* againſt
"the *Lombards*. This addreſs ſeems very adviſedly taken, at leaſt it proves
"very fortunate to them both. For in ſhort time it diſſolved the *Kingdom*
"of the *Lombards* in *Italy*, which had then ſtood two hundred and four years,
"which was the *Popes* ſecurity. And it brought the *Crown* of *France* into the
"houſe of *Charles*, and ſhortly after the *Weſtern Empire*: And now began
"the *Pope* to be great indeed. For by the bounty of *Pepin* Son of *Charles*,
"that which was taken from the *Lombards*, was given to the *Pope*. So that
"now of a *Biſhop*, he became a *Temporal Prince*. But when *Charles* the
"*Great* had ſet up the *Weſtern Empire*, then he reſumed the ancient and ori-
"ginal power of the *Emperour*, to govern the *Church*, to call Councils, to or-

"der

"der *Papal Elections*. And this power continued in his poſterity. For this "right of the *Emperour* was in force and uſe in *Gregory* the ſeventh's time, "who was confirmed in the *Popedom* by *Henry* the fourth, whom he after- "ward depoſed. And it might have continued longer, if the ſucceeding "*Emperours* had had abilities enough to ſecure or vindicate their own Right. "But the *Pope* keeping a ſtrong *Council* about him, and meeting with ſome "weak *Princes*, and they oft-times diſtracted with great and dangerous "wars, grew ſtronger till he got the better. So this is enough to ſhew, How "the *Popes* climbed up by the *Emperours*, till they over-topt them, which is all "I ſaid before, and have now proved. And this was about the year 1073. "Yet was it carried in ſucceeding times with great changes of fortune and "different ſucceſs. The *Emperour* ſometimes plucking from the *Pope*, and "the *Pope* from the *Emperour*, winning and loſing ground, as their ſpirits, "abilities, aids, and opportunities were, till at the laſt the *Pope* ſettled him- "ſelf upon the grounds laid by *Gregory* 7. in the great power which he now "uſes in and over theſe parts of the Chriſtian world. To all this you return a ſhort Anſwer, in theſe words; *We deny not but that in Temporal power and Authority the Popes grew great by the Patronage of Chriſtian Emperours. But what is this to the purpoſe? If he would have ſaid any thing material, he ſhould have proved that the Popes roſe by the Emperours means to their Spiritual Authority and Juriſdiction over all other Biſhops throughout the whole Catholick Church; which is the only thing they claim* jure divino, *and which is ſo annexed to the dignity of their office by Chriſt's inſtitution, that, were the Pope deprived of all his Temporalties, yet could not his Spiritual Authority ſuffer the leaſt diminution by it.* But 1. Doth his Lordſhips diſcourſe only contain an account of the *Popes temporal greatneſs by the Patronage of Chriſtian Emperours?* Doth he not plainly ſhew, How the *Popes* got their power by *rebelling*, and *conteſting* with the *Emperours* themſelves, How they aſſumed to themſelves a power to depoſe *Emperours*: and, Do they claim theſe things *jure Divino* too? 2. What you ſay of the *Popes Spiritual Authority*, will then hold good when it is well proved; but bare aſſerting it, will never do it. We muſt therefore have patience till you have leiſure to attempt it. P. 200.

§. 11. But in the mean time we muſt conſider, How you vindicate the *famous place* of *Irenæus*, concerning, as you ſay, *the Pope's Supreme Paſtoral Authority*, from his Lordſhips interpretation. Yet, before we come to the *Authority* it ſelf, there are *ſome light skirmiſhes* (as you call them) to be paſſed through; and thoſe are, concerning *Irenæus* himſelf. For his Lordſhip ſaith, *That his Adverſary is much ſcanted of ancient proof, if* Irenæus *ſtand alone; beſides,* Irenæus *was a Biſhop of the* Gallican *Church, and a very unlikely man to captivate the liberty of that Church under the more powerful principality of* Rome. *And how can we have better evidence of his judgement, touching that principality, than the actions of his life? When Pope* Victor *excommunicated the* Aſian *Churches,* ἀθρόως, *all at a blow, was not* Irenæus *the chief man that reprehended him for it? A very unmeet and undutiful thing ſure it had been in* Irenæus, *in deeds to tax him of raſhneſs and inconſiderateneſs, whom in words* A. C. *would have to be acknowledged by him, the Supreme and Infallible Paſtour of the Univerſal Church.* To which you Anſwer, 1. *To the liberty of the* Gallican *Church: As if* (*forſooth*) *the ſo much talked of liberties of the* Gallican *Church, had been things known or heard of in St.* Irenæus *his time*; as though there were no difference between not captivating the *Liberty of that Church to* Rome, and aſſerting the *Liberties of the* Gallican *Church* in her obedience to *Rome*, yet theſe two muſt be confounded by you to render his Lordſhips Anſwer ridiculous; which yet is as ſound and rational as your cavil is vain and impertinent. But this you paſs over and fix 2. *Upon his reprehending Pope* Victor, *where* (you ſay) P. 181. n. 13. P. 201. n. 6.

that

that Eusebius *hath not a word importing reprehension, but rather a friendly and seasonable perswasion: his words are* προσηκόντως παραινεῖ, *&c. he exhorts him after a handsome manner, as reflecting on the Popes dignity, and clearly shews that the Pope had of right some Authority over the* Asian *Bishops, and by consequence over the whole Church. For otherwise it had been very absurd in St.* Irenæus *to perswade Pope* Victor, *not to cut off from the Church so many Christian Provinces, had he believed (as Protestants contend he did) that the Pope had no power at all to cut them off. Just as if a man should entreat the Bishop of* Rochester, *not to excommunicate the Archbishop of* York *and all the Bishops of his Province; over whom he hath not any the least pretence of Jurisdiction.* I Answer, that if you say, that *Eusebius hath not a word importing reprehension*, it is a sign you have not read what *Eusebius* saith. For, doth not he expresly say, *That the Epistles of some of the Bishops are yet remaining, in which they do severely rebuke him? Among whom* (saith he) *Irenæus was one, &c.* It seems, *Irenæus* was one of those Bishops who did *so sharply reprehend him*; but it may be, you would render πλησιάσαντες καὶ ἁπτομένων *kissing his Holiness feet*, or, *exhorting him after a handsome manner*; and indeed, if they did it sharply, they did it προσηκόντως *suitably* enough to what *Victor* deserved for his rash and inconsiderate proceedings in this business. But withal to let you see how well these proceedings of his were resented in the Christian world, *Eusebius* tells us before, *That* Victor *by his letters did declare those of the Eastern Churches to be excommunicate*: and he presently adds, *But this did no wayes please all the Bishops*; wherefore (ἀνταπεγκελεύονται) *they countermanded him, that he might mind the things of peace and unity and brotherly love.* And will you still render that word too, by *exhorting him after a handsome manner*, when even *Christopherson* renders it by *magnoperè adhortabantur*, *Valesius* by *ex adverso hortati sunt?* and although these seem not to come up to the full *emphasis* of the word, yet surely they imply somewhat of *vehemency* and *earnestness* in their perswading him as well as their being hugely dissatisfied with what *Victor* did. I grant *that these persons did reflect* (as you say) *on the Pope*, but not as you would have it *on his dignity*, but *on his rashness and indiscretion*, that should go about to cast the *Asian Churches* out of Communion, for such a trifle as that was in Controversie between them. But you are the happiest man at making inferences that I have met with: for, *because* Irenæus *in the name of the* Gallican *Bishops, writes to* Victor, *not to proceed so rashly in this action; thence you infer, that the Pope had of right some Authority over the* Asian *Bishops, and by consequence over the whole Church.* Might you not every jot as well inferr, that when a man in passion is ready to kill those that stand about him; whoever perswades him not to do it, doth suppose he might lawfully have done it, if he would? But if those Bishops had so venerable an esteem (as you would perswade us they had) then of the Bishop of *Rome*, How come they to dispute his actions in so high a manner as they did? If they had looked on him as *Universal Pastor of the Church*, it had more become them to sit still and be quiet, than severely to reprehend him who was alone able to judge what was fit to be done and what not in those cases. If the *Pope* had call'd them to *Council* to have known their advice, it might have been their duty to have given it him in the most humble and submissive manner that might be. But for them to intrude themselves into such an *office*, as to advise the *Head* of the *Church* what to do in a matter peculiarly concerning him, as though he did not know what was fit to be done himself; methinks you should not imagine that these men did act προσηκόντως, as *became them*, in doing it. Could they possibly in any thing more declare, how little they thought it necessary

φέρονται δὲ καὶ τούτων φωναὶ πληκτικώτερον κατ' αὐτὰν τὸν Βίκτορα· ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος, *&c.* Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.

Ἀλλ' ὐ πᾶσί γε τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ταῦτ' ἤρεσκετο, ἀντιπαρεκελεύοντο δ' ἤτα αὐτῷ τὰ εἰρήνης καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον ἑνώσεως καὶ ἀγάπης φρονεῖν. Euseb. ibid.

necessary for all *Churches* to conform to that of *Rome*, when they plead for dissenters in such a matter which the *Pope* had absolutely declared himself about? And how durst any of them slight the *thunderbolts* which the *Pope* threatned them with? Yet not only *Polycrates* and the *Asian* Bishops who joyned with him profess themselves not at all affrighted at them; but the other *Churches* looked not on themselves as obliged to forsake their communion on that account. If this be such an evidence of the *Popes power* in one *sense*, I am sure it is a greater evidence of his *weakness* in another: It seems the *Head* of the *Church* began betimes to be troubled with the *fumes* of *passion*; and it is a little unhappy, that the first *Instance* of his *Authority* should meet with so little regard in the Christian world. If the *Pope* did begin to assume so early, you see it was not very well liked of by the Bishops of other *Churches*. But it seems he had a mind to try his *power* and the weight of his Arm; but for all his haste, he was fain to withdraw it very patiently again. *Valesius* thinks that he never went so far as to excommunicate the *Asian* Bishops at all, but the noise of his threatning to do it being heard by them, (it seems the very preparing of his *thunderbolts* amazed the world) *Irenæus* having call'd a *Synod* of the Bishops of *Gaul* together, doth in their name write that *Letter*, in *Eusebius*, to *Victor* to dissuade him from it, and that it wrought so effectually with him, that he gave it over. And this he endeavours to prove, 1. Because *Eusebius* saith, he only endeavour'd to do it. But *Cardinal Perron* supposeth *Eusebius* had a worse meaning than so in it; *i. e.* that *though the Pope did declare them excommunicate, yet it took no effect because other Bishops continued still in communion with them*; and therefore he calls *Eusebius* an *Arrian* and an enemy to the *Church* of *Rome*, when yet all the records of this story are derived from him. 2. Because the Epistles of *Irenæus* tend to perswade him not to cut them off; whereas, if they had been excommunicate, it would have been rather to have restored them to Communion; and that *Photius* saith, that *Irenæus* writ many letters to *Victor* to prevent their excommunication. But because *Eusebius* saith expresly, *That he did by letters pronounce them out of the Communion of the Church*, the common opinion seems more probable, and so *Socrates* understands it; but still I am to seek for such an Argument of the acknowledgement of the *Popes* Authority then, as you would draw from it. *Yes*, say you, *because they do not tell him, He had no Authority to do what he did; which they would have done if they could without proclaiming themselves Schismaticks* ipso facto *and shaking the very Foundation of the Churches Discipline and Unity.* But all this proceeds from want of understanding the *Discipline* of the *Church* at that time; for excommunication did not imply any such *authoritative act* of throwing men out of the Communion of the *whole Church*, but only a declaring that they would not admit such persons to communion with themselves. And therefore might be done by equals to equals, and sometimes by *Inferiours* to *Superiours*. In *equals* it is apparent by *Johannes Antiochenus* in the *Ephesine Council* excommunicating *Cyril Patriarch* of *Alexandria*; and I suppose you will not acknowledge it may be done by *Inferiours*, if we can produce any examples of *Popes* being excommunicated; and what say you then to the *African* Bishops excommunicating *Pope Vigilius* as *Victor Tununensis* an *African* Bishop himself relates it: Will you say now that *Victors* excommunicating the *Asian Churches* argued his authority over them, when another *Victor* tells us, *that the* African *Bishops solemnly excommunicated the Pope himself?* And I hope you will not deny but the *Bishop of Rochester* might as well excommunicate the *Archbishop of York*, as these *Africans* excommunicate the *Bishop of Rome*. What say you to the expunging the name of

Vales. not. in Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.

Euseb. ibid.

Socr. l. 5. c. 22.

Africani Antistites Vigilium Romanum Episcopum damnatorum trium capitulorum Synodaliter à Catholicâ communione, relervato ti pœnitentiæ loco, recludunt. Victor Tunnenf. Chronic. p. 10.

Felix

Felix Biſhop of Rome out of the *Diptychs* of the *Church*, by *Acacius* the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*? What ſay you to *Hilary's Anathema* againſt *Pope Liberius*? If theſe *excommunications* did not argue juſt power and authority over the perſons excommunicated, neither could *Pope Victors* do it. For it is apparent by the practice of the *Church* that excommunication argued no ſuch *ſuperiority* in the perſons who did it; but all the force of it lay in the ſenſe of the *Church*; for by whomſoever the ſentence was pronounced, if all other *Churches* obſerved it, (as moſt commonly they did while the *Unity* of the *Church* continued) then they were out of the *Communion* of the *Catholick Church*; if not, then it was only the particular declaration of thoſe perſons or *Churches* who did it. And in this caſe the validity of the *Popes* excommunication of the *Aſian Biſhops* depended upon the *acceptance* of it by other *Churches*, which not conſenting to it, he could not throw them out of the communion of the *whole Church*, but only declare, that if they came to *Rome*, he would not admit them to communion with him. And therefore *Ruffinus* well renders that place in *Euſebius* out of *Irenæus* his Epiſtle to *Victor*, ὠθέπλσε διὰ τὸ εἶδ & τοῦτο ἀπεβλήθησαν πνές: by theſe words, *Nunquam tamen ob hoc repulſi ſunt ab Eccleſiæ ſocietate, aut venientes ab illis partibus non ſunt ſuſcepti*, ſo that ἀποβάλλειν may as well ſignifie *not to receive* as *to caſt out*; for the *Churches* not receiving, is her caſting out. Thus, I hope, it is evident that his Lordſhip hath received no injury by theſe *lighter skirmiſhes*.

§. 12. P. 201. We now follow you into *hotter ſervice*; For you ſay, *he ventures at laſt to grapple with the Authority it ſelf, alledged by* A. C. *out of St.* Irenæus; where, in the firſt place, you wink and ſtrike; and let your blows fall beſides him, for fear he ſhould return them, or ſome one for him. You quarrel with his *tranſlation of the Authority cited by him*: but that the ground of this quarrel may be underſtood, we muſt firſt enquire what his Lordſhip hath to ſay for himſelf. *The place of* Irenæus *is*, *To this Church* (*he ſpeaks of* Rome), propter potentiorem principalitatem, *for the more powerful Principality of it, 'tis neceſſary that every Church, that is the faithful,* undique *round about, ſhould have recourſe. Now for this,* (his Lordſhip ſaith) *there was very great reaſon in* Irenæus *his time, that upon any difference ariſing in the faith,* Omnes undique Fideles, *all the faithful, or, if you will, all the Churches round about, ſhould have recourſe, that is, reſort to* Rome *being the Imperial City, and ſo a Church of more powerful Principality, than any other at that time in thoſe parts of the world. But this* (his Lordſhip ſaith) *will not exalt* Rome *to be Head of the Church Univerſal.* Here your blood riſes, and you begin a moſt furious encounter with his Lordſhip for tranſlating *undique round about, as if* (ſay you) *St.* Irenæus *ſpake only of thoſe neighbouring Churches round about* Rome, *and not the Churches throughout the world*; *whereas* undique *as naturally ſignifies, every where, and, from all parts: witneſs* Thomas Thomaſius, *where the word* undique *is thus Engliſhed, From all parts, places, and corners, every where.* Can you blame me now if I ſeek for a retreat into ſome *ſtrong-hold*, or if you will, ſome *more powerful Principality*, when I ſee ſo dreadful a Charge begun, with *Thomas Thomaſius* in the Front? You had routed us once before with *Rider, and other Engliſh Lexicons*; but it ſeems *Rider* had done ſervice enough that time, now that venerable perſon *Thomas Thomaſius* muſt be upon duty, and do his ſhare for the Catholick Cauſe. You ſomewhere complain *how much Catholicks are ſtraitned for want of Books*, Would any one believe you that find you ſo well ſtored with *Thomas Thomaſius, Rider, and other Engliſh Lexicons*? You would ſure give us ſome cauſe of ſuſpicion that there is ſome *Jeſuits School* taught

Ad hanc Eccleſiam propter potentiorum principalitatem, neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam, i.e. eos qui ſunt undique fideles: In quâ ſempr ab his qui ſunt undique, conſervata eſt ea quæ eſt ab Apoſtolis traditio. Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

taught in *England*, and that you are the learned *Maſter* of it, by your being ſo converſant in theſe worthy Authours. But although the Authority of *T. Thomaſius* ſignifie very little with us, yet that of the *Greek Lexicons* might do much more if we had the original *Greek* of *Irenæus* inſtead of his barbarous Latine Interpreter. For now it is uncertain what word *Irenæus* uſed, and ſo it is but a very uncertain conjecture which can be drawn from the ſignification of πάντοθεν, πανταχόθεν, ἁπανταχῆ, unleſs we knew, which of them was the genuine word in the *Greek* of *Irenæus*. But you ſay, *all of them undeniably ſignifie, from all parts Univerſally*: and that becauſe they are rendred by the word *undique*. So that this will make an excellent proof, *undique* muſt ſignifie from all parts, becauſe πάντοθεν, πανταχόθεν, ἁπανταχῆ *do ſignifie ſo in Greek*; and that theſe do undeniably ſignifie ſo much, appears becauſe they are rendred by *undique*. And I grant they are ſo: for in the old *Gloſſary* which goes under the name of *Cyril*, *undique* is rendred by παντοθεν, and *Tully* (than whom we cannot poſſibly deſire a better Authour in this caſe) renders πάντοθεν, by *undique*. For in his Book *de Finibus*, he tranſlates that of *Epicurus* πάντοθεν εἰσπλησμόροις ἡδονῶν by *undique complerentur voluptatibus*; and ſo he renders that paſſage in *Plato's Timæus*, παντα χῆ τε ἰσομέζε ἴσην by *undique æquabilem*, although as *Hen. Stephanus* notes, that be rather the ſignification of πανταχόθεν than παντα χῆ, but ſtill there is ſome difference between πανταχόθεν, and ἁπανταχόθεν, and ſo ἁπανταχόθεν γῆς in *Greek Authors* notes *ex omni parte terræ*, but πανταχόθεν only *ex quâvis parte*; ſo that the one ſignifies *Univerſally*, the other *indefinitely*: *undique* relating properly to the *circumference*, as *undique æqualis, on all ſides it is equal*; ſo that *qui ſunt undique fideles*, are, thoſe which lye upon *all quarters round about*. And ſo it doth not imply that all perſons were *bound to come*, but that from *all quarters ſome did come*; as *Herodian* ſpeaks of *Rome*, πολυανθρώπῳ τε ὔσῃ, καὶ πανταχόθεν ἐπιδημούσῃ, *that it was very populous, and did receive them which came from all parts*; which doth very fitly explain the ſenſe of *Irenæus*, that to *Rome* being the *Imperial City*, men came from *all quarters*. But the ſenſe of this will be more fully underſtood by a parallel expreſſion in the *ninth Canon* of the *Council of Antioch*, in which it is decreed that the *Metropolitan* ſhould have the care of all the *Biſhops* in his *Province*, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς τὰ πράγματα ἔχοντας, *becauſe all perſons who have buſineſs from all parts, reſort to the Metropolis*: here πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν, is the very ſame with the *undiq; convenire*, in *Irenæus*; ſo that it relates not to any *Obligation* on *Churches to reſort thither*, but that being the *Seat* of the *Empire*, all believers from all parts did make their recourſe thither. Which is moſt fully expreſſed by *Leo*, ſpeaking of S. *Peter's* coming to *Rome*. *Cujus nationis homines in hâc Urbe non eſſent? aut quæ uſpiam gentes ignorarent, quod Roma didiciſſet?* And ſo, if I grant you that it extends *to all parts*, I know not what advantages you will get by it: for *Irenæus* his deſign is, to ſhew that there was no ſuch ſecret Tradition left by the *Apoſtles*, as the *Valentinians* pretended. And for this he appeals to the *Church* of *Rome*, which being ſeated in the *Imperial City*, to which Believers from all parts did reſort, it is impoſſible to conceive that the *Apoſtles* ſhould have left ſuch a Tradition, and it not to be heard of there: which is the plain, genuine meaning of *Irenæus* his words. Not as you weakly imagine, *That all Churches in all doubts of Faith, were bound to have their recourſe thither, as to their conſtant guide therein.* For *Irenæus* was not diſputing, What was to be done by Chriſtians in doubts of Faith; but was enquiring into a matter of fact, *viz.* Whether any ſuch *Tradition* were ever left in the *Church*, or no; and therefore nothing could be more pertinent or convincing, than appealing to that *Church* to which *Chriſtians* reſorted from all

De Finib. l. 2. *v. Hen. Steph. Lexicon Ciceron. p. 55.*

Herod. hiſt. l. 1. p. 18.

Concil. Antioch. Can. 9.

Leo. Sermon. de S. Petro & Paulo.

P. 202.

parts; for it could not be conceived, but, if the *Apoſtles* had left ſuch a *Tradition* any where, it would be heard of at *Rome*. And you moſt notoriouſly pervert the meaning of *Irenæus*, when you would make the force of his argument to lye *in the neceſſity of all Chriſtians reſorting to* Rome, *becauſe the Doctrine or Tradition of the Roman Church was, as it were, the touchſtone of all Apoſtolical Doctrine*. But, I ſuppoſe, you deal in ſome *Engliſh Logicians*, as well as *Engliſh Lexicons*, and therefore I muſt ſubmit both to your *Grammar* and *Logick*: but your ingenuity is as great as your reaſon; for you firſt pervert his Lordſhips meaning, and then make him diſpute ridiculouſly, that you might come out with your triumphant language, *Is not this fine Meandrick Logick, well beſeeming ſo noble a Labyrinth?* Whereas his Lordſhips reaſoning is ſo plain and clear, that none but ſuch a one as had a *Labyrinth* in his brains, could have imagined any *Meanders* in it: As appears by what I have ſaid already, in the explication of the meaning of *Irenæus*.

§. 13. But that I may ſee the ſtrength of your *Logick* out of this place of *Irenæus*, I will tranſlate *undiq*; and *ſemper*, *as fully* as you would have me, and give you the words at large, *in which, by thoſe who come from all places, the Apoſtolical Tradition is alwaies conſerved*. What is it you inferr hence?

P. 203. *From the Premiſes you argue thus: All the faithful every where, muſt of neceſſity have recourſe to the Church of* Rome, *by reaſon of her more powerful principality. This is S.* Irenæus *his propoſition. But there could be no neceſſity they all ſhould have recourſe to that Church, by reaſon of her more powerful principality, if her ſaid power extended not to them all. This is evident to reaſon.* Ergo, *this more powerful principality of the Roman Church, muſt needs extend to all the faithful every where, and not onely to thoſe of the Suburbicary Churches, or Patriarchal Dioceſe of* Rome, *as the Biſhop pleads*. Now I ſee, you are a man at arms, and know, not only how to *grapple* with his Lordſhip, but with *Irenæus* to boot. But we muſt firſt ſee, How *Irenæus* himſelf argues, that we may the better underſtand the force of what you deduce from him. The Queſtion, as I have told you already, was, Whether the *Apoſtles* left any ſuch Tradition in the *Church*, as the *Valentinians* pretended: *Irenæus* proves they did not, becauſe, if there had been any ſuch, the Apoſtolical Churches would certainly have preſerved the memory of it; but becauſe it would be too tedious to inſiſt on the ſucceſſion of all *Churches*, he therefore makes choice of the moſt famous, the *Church* of *Rome*, in which the *Apoſtolical Tradition* had been derived by a ſucceſſion of *Biſhops* down to his own time; *and by this* (ſaith he) *we confound all thoſe who through vain glory, or blindneſs, do gather any ſuch thing. For* (ſaith he) *to this Church for the more powerful principality all Churches do make reſort*, i. e. *the believers from all parts, in which by thoſe who come from all parts the Apoſtolical Tradition is alwayes preſerved*. We muſt now ſee, How *Irenæus* argues according to your ſenſe of his words. If all the faithful every where, muſt of neceſſity have recourſe to the *Church* of *Rome*, for *her more powerful principality*; then there is no ſecret Tradition left by the *Apoſtles*. But, Where lyes the connexion between theſe two? What had the *Valentinians* to do with the power of the *Church* of *Rome* over other *Churches*? That was not the buſineſs they diſputed; their Queſtion was, Whether there were no ſuch *Tradition* as they pretended? And *Rome* might have never ſo great power over all *Churches*, and yet have this ſecret *Tradition* too. For now we ſee, when ſhe pretends to the greateſt power, nay, to *Infallibility*, ſhe pretends the higheſt to *Traditions*. Where then lyes the force of *Irenæus* his argument? Was it in this, that the *Valentinians* did acknowledge the *Infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome* then, in Traditions? This were indeed to the purpoſe, if it could be proved; Or, Doth *Irenæus* go about to prove this

this firſt? But by what argument doth he prove it ſo, that the *Valentinians* might be convinced by it? *Yes*, ſay you, *he ſaith, That all the faithful muſt of neceſſity have recourſe to the Church of* Rome? This is your way of proving indeed, to take things for granted; but, How doth this *neceſſity* appear? becauſe, ſay you, *ſhe hath the more powerful principality*: But, What *principality* do you mean? over all *Churches*? But that was the thing in *Queſtion*. So that if you will make *Irenæus* ſpeak ſenſe, and argue pertinently, his meaning can be no other than this. If there be ſuch a *Tradition* left, it muſt be left ſomewhere among *Chriſtians*: if it be left among them, it may be known by enquiry, Whether they own any ſuch or no. But becauſe it would be troubleſome ſearching of all *Churches*, we may know their judgement more compendiouſly; there is the *Church* of *Rome* near us, a famous and ancient *Church*, ſeated in the chief *City* of the *Empire*, to which all perſons have *neceſſities* to go; and among them, you cannot but ſuppoſe, but that out of every *Church* ſome faithful perſons ſhould come, and therefore it is very unreaſonable to think, that the *Apoſtolical Tradition* hath not alwaies been preſerved there, when perſons come from all places thither. Is not every thing in this account of *Irenæus* his words very clear and pertinent to his preſent diſpute? But in the ſenſe you give of them they are little to the purpoſe, and very precarious and inconſequent. And therefore ſince *the more powerful principality* is not that of the *Church*, but of the *City*; ſince the neceſſity of *recourſe* thither, is not *for doubts of Faith*, but other occaſions: therefore it by no means follows thence, *That this Churches power did extend over the faithful every where*; thus by explaining your Propoſition, your Concluſion is aſhamed of it ſelf, and runs away. For your argument comes to this; If Engliſh men from all parts be forced to reſort to *London*, then *London* hath the power over all *England*; or if one ſhould ſay, if ſome from all *Churches* in *England* muſt reſort to *London*, then the *Church* at *London* hath power over all the *Churches* in *England*; and if this conſequence be good, yours is; for it is of the ſame nature of it; the neceſſity of the *reſort*, not lying in the *Authority* of the *Church*, but in the *Dignity* of the City, the words in all probability in the Greek, being διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀξίαν, and ſo relate to the *dignity* of *Rome*, as the *Imperial City*.

§. 14. From whence we proceed to the Vindication of *Ruffinus*, in his Tranſlation of the 6. *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*. The occaſion of which is this. His Lordſhip ſaith, *Suppoſing that the powerful principality be aſcribed to the Church of* Rome, *yet it follows not that it ſhould have power over all Churches*; P. 183. *for this power was confined within its own Patriarchate and Juriſdiction, and that* (ſaith he) *was very large, containing all the Provinces in the Dioceſe of* Italy (*in the old ſenſe of the word Dioceſe*) *which Provinces the Lawyers and others term Suburbicaries. There were ten of them; the three Iſlands,* Sicily, Corſica, *and* Sardinia, *and the other ſeven upon the firm Land of* Italy. *And this, I take it, is plain in* Ruffinus. *For he living ſhortly after the Nicene Council, as he did, and being of* Italy, *as he was, he might very well know the bounds of the Patriarchs Juriſdiction, as it was then practiſed. And he ſayes expreſly, that according to the old cuſtom, the Roman Patriarchs charge was confined within the limits of the Suburbican Churches. To avoid the force of this teſtimony, Cardinal* Perron *laies load upon* Ruffinus. *For he charges him with paſſion, ignorance, and raſhneſs. And one piece of his ignorance is, that he hath ill tranſlated the Canon of the Council of* Nice. *Now, although his Lordſhip doth not approve of it as a Tranſlation; yet he ſaith,* Ruffinus *living in that time and place, was very like well to know and underſtand the limits and bounds of that Patriarchate of* Rome, *in which he lived. This*

Apud Alexandriam ut in urbe Româ, vetuſta conſuetudo ſervetur, ut ille Ægypti ut hic Suburbicariarum Eccleſiarum ſolicitudinem gerat. Ruffin. Eccleſ. hiſt. l. 1. c. 6.

p. 203. n. 7. (you ſay) *is very little to his Lordſhips advantage, ſince it is inconſiſtent with the vote of all Antiquity, and gives S.* Irenæus *the lye*; but if the former be no truer than the latter, it may be very much to his advantage, notwithſtanding what you have produced to the contrary. What the ground is, Why the *Roman Patriarchate* was confined within the *Roman Dioceſe*, I have already ſhewed in the precedent Chapter, in explication of the *Nicene Canon*. We muſt now therefore examine the Reaſons you bring, Why the notion of the *Suburbicary Churches* muſt be extended beyond the limits his Lordſhip aſſigns; that *of the ſmalneſs of Juriſdiction compared with other Patriarchs*, I have given an account of already, *viz.* from the correſpondency of the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Government; for the Civil *Dioceſes* of the *Eaſtern* part of the *Empire* did extend much farther than the *Weſtern* did; and that was the Reaſon, Why the *Patriarchs* of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, had a larger *Metropolitical* Juriſdiction than the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had. But you tell us, *That Suburbicary Churches muſt be taken as generally all Churches and Cities any waies ſubordinate to the City of* Rome; *which was at that time known by the name of* Urbs, *or City*, κατ' ἐξοχήν, *by way of excellency; not as it related to the Præfect or Governour of* Rome, *in regard of whoſe ordinary Juriſdiction, we confeſs it commanded only thoſe few places about it in* Italy; *but as it related to the Emperour himſelf; in which ſenſe the word Suburbicary, rightly ſignifies all Cities or Churches whatſoever within the Roman Empire; as the word* Romania *alſo anciently ſignified the whole Imperial Territory, as Card.* Perron *clearly proves upon this ſubject.* But, this is one inſtance of what mens wits will do, when they are reſolved to break through any thing: For, whoever that had read of the *Suburbicary Regions and Provinces* in the *Code* of *Theodoſius*, or other parts of the *Civil Law*, as diſtinguiſhed from other *Provinces* under the *Roman Empire*, and thoſe in *Italy* too, could ever have imagined that the notion of *Suburbicary Churches* had been any other than what was correſpondent to thoſe *Regions* and *Provinces?* But let that be granted which *Sirmondus* ſo much contends for, That the notion of *Suburbicary* may have different reſpects, and ſo ſometimes be taken for the *Churches* within the *Roman Dioceſe*, ſometimes for thoſe within the *Roman Patriarchate*, and ſometimes for thoſe, which are under the *Pope* as *Univerſal Paſtor*; yet, How doth it appear that ever *Ruffinus* took it in any other than the firſt ſenſe? No other *Provinces* being called *Suburbicary*, but ſuch as were under the Juriſdiction either of the *Roman Prefect* within *a hundred miles* of the City (within which compaſs, references and appeals were made to him) or at the moſt, to the *Lieutenant* of the *Roman Dioceſe*, whoſe Juriſdiction extended to thoſe *ten Provinces* which his Lordſhip mentions. It is not therefore, In what ſenſe words may be taken, but in what ſenſe they were taken, and what Evidence there is that ever they were ſo underſtood. Never was any Controverſie more ridiculous, than that concerning the extent of the *Suburbicary Regions or Provinces*, if *Suburbicary* were taken in your ſenſe for all the *Cities* within *the Roman Empire*. But this extending to the *Suburbicary Churches*, as far as the *Roman Empire*, is like the art of thoſe *Jeſuits*, who in their ſetting forth *Anaſtaſius de vitis Pontificum*, in *Stephanus* 5. turn'd *Papa Urbis* into *Papa Orbis*: for that being ſo mean and contemptible a title, they thought much it ſhould remain as it did; but *Papa Orbis* was magnificent and glorious. I wonder therefore, that inſtead of extending the ſignification of *Suburbicary Churches*, you do not rather pretend that it ought to be read *Suborbicary*, and ſo to ſuit exactly with the *Papa Orbis*, as importing all thoſe *Churches* which are under the power of the *Univerſal Paſtour*. For, Why ſhould you ſtop at the confines of the *Roman Empire?* How comes his Juriſdiction to be confined within that? By what

Cod. Theodoſ. l. 11. tit. 1. c. 9. tit 16. c. 12. tit. 28. 12

Adventor. p. 2 de Eccleſ. ſuburbic. c. 1.

right

right did he govern the *Churches* within the *Empire*, and not those without? Surely not, as *Primate*, *Metropolitan*, or *Patriarch* of the *Roman Empire*, for those are titles yet unheard of in *Antiquity*; if as *Head of the Church*, How comes the *Jurisdiction* of that to be at all limited? Were there no *Churches* without the *Empire* then? I hope you will not deny that: If there were, To whom did the *Jurisdiction* over them belong? to the *Pope*, or not? If not, How comes he to be *Head of the Church, and Universal Pastour*? If they did, Why were not these *Suburbicary Churches*, as well as those within the *Empire*? Besides, it is confessed by the learnedest among you, that when the notion of *Suburbicary* is extended beyond the *Suburbicary Provinces*, it is not out of any relation to the City, but to the power of the *Bishop* of the *City*, and therefore the *Suburbicary Churches* may be larger than the *Suburbicary Provinces*. But if this be true (as it is the only probable evasion) then it is impossible for you, to confine the *Suburbicary Churches* within the *Roman Empire*, without confining the *Jurisdiction* of the *Roman Bishop* within those *bounds* too. For if the inlarging the notion of *Surburbicary Churches* depends upon the extent of his power, the fixing the *limits* of those *Churches*, determines the bounds of his power too. Which is utterly destructive to your pretences of the *Pope's being Head of the Universal Church*, and not barely of the *Churches* within the *Roman Empire*. But if it had been *Ruffinus* his design to express by *Suburbicary Churches*, all those within the *Roman Empire*, surely he made choice of the most unhappy expression to do it by, which he could well have thought of. For, it being then so well known what the *Suburbicary Provinces* were, that in the *Code* of *Theodosius*, where they are so often mentioned, they are not distinctly enumerated, because they were then as well understood as the *African*, *Gallican*, or *Britannick Provinces*; How absurd were it for him, to take a word in common use, and so well known, and apply it to such a sense, as no example besides can be produced for it? For if any one at that time should have spoken of the *African*, *Gallican*, or *Britannick Churches*, no one would have imagined any other than those which were contained in the several *Provinces* under those names. What reason is there then, that any thing else should be apprehended by *the Suburbicary Churches*? I know the last refuge of most of your side, instead of explaining these *Suburbicary Churches*, hath been to rail at *Ruffinus*, and call him *Dunce* and *Blockhead*, and enemy to the *Roman Church* (instances were easie to be given, if it were at all necessary) but besides that, it were easie to make it appear, that *Ruffinus* was no such fool, as some have taken him for: (And if they think so, because S. *Hierom* gives him such hard words, they must think so of all whom S. *Hierom* opposed) he is sufficiently vindicated in this translation by the *Ancient Vatican Copy* of the *Nicene Canons*, out of which this very *Canon* is produced by *Sirmondus*, and the very same word of *Suburbicary* therein used. And that in such a manner, as utterly destroies your sense of the *Suburbicary Churches*, for such as are within the *Roman Empire*; for that Copy calls them, *Loca Suburbicaria*, and, Will you say, those are the *Provinces* within the *Roman Empire* too? Can any one rationally think that any other places should be called *Suburbicary*, but such as lye *about the City*? And by the same interpretation which you here use, you may call all *England* the *Suburbs* of *London*; because *London is the City*, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, as you speak; and therefore all the *Churches* of *England* must be *Suburbicary* to *London*. But if you think this incongruous, you may on the same account judge the other to be so too: It appears then, that the *Suburbicary places* in

De primatu Ecclesiæ Romanæ & aliarum civitatum Episcopis. Antiqui moris est, ut Episcopus urbis Romæ habeat Principatum; ut Suburbicaria loca, & omnem Provinciam suam sollicitudine gubernet. Codex Vaticanus apud Sirmond. de Region. & Eccles. Suburb.

in the *Vatican Copy* (and in that very *Ancient Copy* which *Juſtellus* had, which agrees with the *Vatican*) are the ſame with the *Suburbicary Churches* in *Ruffinus*; and, if you will explain theſe latter of the *Roman Empire*, you muſt do the former too. But not only the *Vatican Copy*, but all other different *Verſions* of the *Nicene Canon* utterly overthrow this *Opinion* of *Cardinal Perron*, that the *Suburbicary Churches* muſt be taken for thoſe within the *Roman Empire*. For in the *Arabick* Verſion publiſhed by *Turrianus*, it is thus rendred, *Siquidem ſimiliter Epiſcopus Romæ, i. e. ſucceſſor Petri Apoſtoli, poteſtatem habet omnium civitatum, & locorum quæ ſunt circa eam.* Are all the Cities and places in the *Roman Empire*, *circa eam*, about the *City of Rome*? If not, neither can the *Churches* be? And in that *Arabick* paraphraſe, which *Salmaſius* had of the famous *Peireskius*, it is tranſlated much more agreeably to the *Nicene Canon* in theſe words; *Propterea quod Epiſcopus Romanus etiam hunc morem obtinet, & hoc ei adjunctum eſt, ut poteſtatem habeat ſupra civitates, & loca quæ prope eam ſunt.* Which is yet more full, to ſhew the abſurdity of your expoſition, for theſe *Suburbicary Churches* muſt be then in places near the City of *Rome*. And agreeably to theſe, *Ariſtinus*, the *Greek Collector* of the *Canons* hath it, καὶ ὁ Ῥώμης τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥώμην, which *Ruffinus* his *Suburbicary* doth exactly render. By whom now, muſt we be judged, what is meant by theſe *Suburbicary Churches?* by you who make a forced and ſtrained interpretation of the word *Suburbicary* to ſuch a ſenſe, of which there is no evidence in *Antiquity*, or Reaſon, and is withall manifeſtly repugnant to the deſign of the *Canon*, which is to proportion the *Dioceſes* of the *Biſhops* of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, by the example of *Rome* (which had been very abſurd if theſe *Suburbicary Churches* did comprehend the *Dioceſes* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and all other *Provinces*, as you make them)? or elſe muſt we be judged by the ancient *Verſions* of the *Nicene Canon*, *Latin* and *Arabick*, and by other *Greek Paraphraſes*, all which unanimouſly concurr to overthrow that *Figment*, that the *Suburbicary Churches are all thoſe within the Roman Empire*. And this the learned *Petrus de Marcâ* was ſo ſenſible of, that he ſaith, *Ruffinus* did *rectiſſimè & ex uſu recepto*, very agreeably both to reaſon and cuſtom, compare the *Alexandrian* and *Roman Biſhop* in this, that he ſhould have the power over the *Dioceſe* of *Ægypt*, by the ſame right that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had over the *Urbicary Dioceſe*; or, ſaith he, *ut Ruffinus elegantiſſimè loquitur, In Eccleſiis Suburbicariis, id eſt, in iis Eccleſiis quæ decem Provinciis Suburbicariis continebantur*; *as* Ruffinus *moſt elegantly ſpeaks* (ſure then he thought him no ſuch ignorant perſon, as *Perron* and others from him have reproached him to be) *In the Suburbicary Churches*, that is, *in thoſe Churches which are contained in the ten Suburbicary Provinces. For*, as he goes on, *the calling of Synods, the ordination of Biſhops, the full adminiſtration of the Churches in thoſe Provinces, did belong to the Biſhop of* Rome; *as to the Biſhop of* Alexandria *in the Ægyptian Dioceſe, and to the Biſhop of* Antioch *in the Orential.* Which he likewiſe confirms by the ancient *Latin Interpreter* of the *Nicene Canons*, who, he ſaith, was elder than *Dionyſius Exiguus*; in whoſe interpretation, he makes the *Suburbicaria loca* to contain the *four Regions about Rome*, which made the proper Metropolitan Province of the *Roman Biſhop*, comprehending ſixty nine *Biſhopricks*; and that which he calls his *Province*, to be the *Urbicary Dioceſe*, contained in thoſe *ten Provinces* which his Lordſhips mentions.

De Concordia Sacerdot. & Imp. l. 1. c. 7. ſect. 6.

§. 15. But the *Pope's* being *Univerſal Biſhop* having ſo little evidence elſewhere, his Lordſhips adverſary at laſt hath recourſe to this, *That the Biſhop of* Rome *is S.* Peter's *ſucceſſor, and therefore to him we muſt have recourſe.* To which his Lordſhip anſwers; *The Fathers I deny not, aſcribe very much to* S. Peter; *but 'tis to* S. Peter *in his own perſon. And among them* Epiphanius

P. 185. n. 14.

nius *is as free and as frequent in extolling S.* Peter, *as any of them: And yet did he never intend to give an absolute principality to* Rome *in S.* Peter's *right; which he at large manifests by a place particularly insisted on, in which he proves, that the building of the Church on S.* Peter *in* Epiphanius *his sense, is not as if he and his successors were to be Monarchs over it for ever: but it is the edifying and establishing the Church in the true Faith of Christ, by the Confession which S.* Peter *made. And so,* saith he, *he expresses himself elsewhere most plainly, that Christ's building his Church upon this Rock, was upon the Confession of S.* Peter, *and the solid Faith contained therein. And that* Epiphanius *could not mean that S.* Peter *was any Rock or Foundation of the Church, so as that he and his successors must be relyed on in all matters of Faith, and govern the Church like Princes and Monarchs,* he proves *not only by the Context, but because he makes S.* James *to succeed our Lord in the principality of the Church. And* Epiphanius, saith he, *was too full of learning and industry, to speak contrary to himself in a point of this moment.* This is the summ of his Lordships discourse: to which you answer, *That it is clear even by the Texts of* Epiphanius, *that this promise by Christ to S.* Peter, *is derived to his successors*; which you prove *from hence, because he saith, That by the Gates of Hell, Heresies and Hereticks are understood: now this, say you, cannot be understood of St.* Peter's *person alone; for then, Why not Heresies and Hereticks prevail against the Church after S.* Peter's *death; yea so far as utterly to extinguish the true Faith?* But, Cannot *God* preserve the *Church* from being extinguished by *Heresies*, though S. *Peter* hath no *Infallible Successor*? Is not the promise, That the *Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church?* It doth not say, That the *Gates of Hell* shall not prevail against any that shall pretend to be his *Successors at Rome*: For if *Heresies* be those *Gates*, they have too often prevailed against them. And, Is this your way indeed to secure the *Church*, by providing S. *Peter* such successors, which may be *Hereticks* themselves? But much more wisely did S. *Gregory* say, If one pretends to be *Universal Bishop*, then upon his falling, the *Church* must fall too; much more wisely the *Council* of *Basil* in their Synodal Epistle, object this as the necessary consequent of the Doctrine of the *Pope's Supremacy*, that, *errante Pontifice, quod sæpe contigit & contingere potest, tota erraret Ecclesia*; that, in case the *Pope erre*, which often hath happened, and often may, the whole *Church* must erre too. And yet this is your way to secure the *Church* fro n errours and heresies. If you designed to ruine it, you could not do it in a more compendious way, than to oblige the whole *Church* to believe the dictates of one, who is so far from that *Infallibility* which St. *Peter* had, that he follows him in nothing more than his *Falls*: I wish he would in his *Repentance* too, and that would be the best way to secure the *Church* from *Errours* and *Heresies*. Which she can never be secured from, as long as one pretends to be her *Head*, who may not only erre himself, but propound that to be believed *infallibly*, which is notoriously false. For that *Popes* as *Popes* may erre, and propound false Doctrine to the Church, not only *Protestants*, but some of your own Communion have abundantly proved; particularly *Sim. Vigorius* in his defence of *Richerius* in his Commentary on the forecited *Synodal Epistle of the Council of* Basil. And calls that opinion, That the *Pope* may erre as a private Doctor, but not as *Pope*, *ineptissimam opinionem, a most foolish opinion*. For otherwise, as he saith, it would be most absurd to say, *That the Pope might be deposed for Heresie*; for he is not deposed as a private *Doctor*, but as *Pope*. And this he proves by the contradictious decrees of *Adrian* 3. to *Adrian* 1. and *Leo* 7. and so of *Formosus*, *Martinus*, *Romanus*, to *Johannes*, *Stephanus*, and *Sergius*; Nay, he instanceth in that famous decree of *Boniface* 8. in pronouncing so definitively, that it was *de necessitate salutis*;

P. 204. n. 9.

Vigorius Com. in ep. Synod. Concil. Basil. c 7. p. 83.

ſalutis, ſubeſſe Romano Pontifici (neceſſary to ſalvation to be ſubject to the Pope) and that he decreed this as *Pope*, appears by thoſe words, *Declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus, omnino eſſe de neceſſitate ſalutis*; than which words, nothing can be more expreſs and definitive, and yet *Pope Innocent* 3. aſſerts, that the *King of France* hath *no ſuperiour upon earth*. Is not the *Church* like then to be well ſecured from *Hereſies*, when her *Infallible Heads* may ſo apparently contradict each other, and this acknowledged by men of your own Communion? Nothing then can be more abſurd or unreaſonable, than to ſay, That the *Church* cannot be preſerved from being extinguiſhed by *Hereſie*, unleſs the *Pope* be S. *Peter's ſucceſſor*, as *Head of the Church*. To his Lordſhips teſtimonies out of *Epiphanius*, that S. *James ſucceeded our Lord in the principality of the Church*, you anſwer, 1. *That in the places he alledges, there's not a word of the Churches principality.* 2. *That he only implies that he was the firſt of the Apoſtles made Biſhop of any particular place*, viz. *at* Hieruſalem, *which is called Chriſt's Throne, as any Epiſcopal Chair is in ancient Eccleſiaſtical Writers.* But, whoſoever will examine the places in *Epiphanius*, will find much more intended by him, than what you will allow: For not only he ſaith, that he firſt had an *Epiſcopal Chair*; but that our Lord committed to him ἡ θρόνον αὐτῶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *his Throne upon Earth*, which ſurely is much more than can be ſaid of any meer *Epiſcopal Chair*; and I believe you will be much to ſeek where *Hieruſalem* was ever called *Chriſt's Throne upon earth* after his Aſcenſion to *Heaven*. Beſides, if it were, it is the ſtrongeſt prejudice that may be againſt the *principality* of the *Roman See*, if *Jeruſalem* was made by *Chriſt* his *Throne* here. And, that a *principality* over the whole *Church* is intended by *Epiphanius*, ſeems more clear by that other place which his Lordſhip cites, wherein he not only ſaith, *That* James *was firſt made Biſhop*, but gives this reaſon for it, *becauſe he was the Brother of our Lord*; and if you obſerve, How *Epiphanius* brings it in, you will ſay, he intended more by it, than to make him the *firſt Biſhop*. For he was diſputing before, How the *Kingdom* and the *Prieſthood* did both belong to Chriſt, and that Chriſt had transfuſed both into his *Church*, ἵδρυται ἡ ὁ θρόνω ἐν τῆ ἁγίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *but his Throne is eſtabliſhed for ever in his holy Church*; conſiſting both of his Kingdom and Prieſthood, both which he communicated to his Church; *quare Jacobus primus omnium eſt Epiſcopus conſtitutus*, as *Petavius* renders it, ſo that he ſeems to ſettle *James* in that *principality* of the *Church*, which he had given to it; and what reaſon can you have to think, but that *Chriſt's Throne*, in which *Epiphanius* ſaith, *James* was ſetled, in the other place, is the ſame with his *Throne* in the *Church* which he mentions here? And, What would you give for ſo clear a teſtimony in Antiquity for *Chriſt's ſettling* S. *Peter* in his *Throne* at *Rome*, as here is for his placing S. *James* in it at *Jeruſalem*?

P. 205.

Epiph. hæreſ. 78. p. 1039.

§. 16. His Lordſhip goes on. *And he ſtill tells us, the Biſhop of* Rome *is S.* Peter's *ſucceſſor. Well, ſuppoſe that, What then? What? Why then, he ſucceeded in all S.* Peter's *prerogatives which are ordinary, and belonged to him as a Biſhop, though not in the extraordinary, which belonged to him as an Apoſtle. For that is it which you all ſay, but no man proves.* Yes, you ſay, *Bellarmine hath done it in his diſputations on that ſubject.* For this you produce a ſaying of his, *That when the Apoſtles were dead, the Apoſtolical Authority remained alone in S.* Peter's *ſucceſſor.* I ſee with you ſtill, *ſaying* and *proving* are all one. But ſince you referr the Reader to *Bellarmine* for proofs, I ſhall likewiſe referr him to the many ſufficient Anſwers which have been given him.

P. 187. n. 15.

You argue ſtoutly afterwards, *That becauſe Primacy in the modern ſenſe of it implies Supremacy, therefore wherever the Fathers attribute a Primacy to* Peter

Hæreſ. 29. p. 119.

P. 206.

Peter *among the Apostles, they mean his Authority and power over them.* I see, you are resolved to believe that there cannot be one, two, and three; but the *first* must be *Head* over all the rest. A *Primacy of Order*, his Lordship truly saith, *was never denied him by Protestants; and an universal Supremacy of power was never granted him by the Primitive Christians.* Prove but in the first place that S. *Peter* had such a *Supremacy* of power over the Apostles, and all *Christian Churches*, and that this power is conveyed to the *Pope*, you will do something. In the mean time we acknowledge as much *Primacy, Authority, and Principality in S.* Peter, as D. *Reynolds* proves in the place you cite, none of which come near that *Supremacy of power* which you contend for, and we must deny till we see it better proved than it is by you. But you offer it from S. *Hierom*, because he saith, *The Primacy was given to* Peter *for preventing Schism, but a meer precedency of order is not sufficient for that.* But, Doth not S. *Hierom* in the words immediately before, say, *That the Church is equally built on all the Apostles, and that they all receive the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that the firmness of the Church is equally grounded on them*; and, Can he possibly then mean in the following words any other *Primacy*, but such as is among *equals*, and not any *Supremacy of power* over them? And certainly you think the *Apostles* very *unruly*, who would not be kept in order by such a *Primacy* as this is, unless S. *Peter* had full *jurisdiction* over them. And since it is so evident, that S. *Hierom* can mean no other but such a *preheminence* as this for preventing *Schism*, you had need have a good art, that can deduce from thence *a necessity of a Supremacy of power in the Church for that end.* For, say you, *Whatsoever power or jurisdiction was necessary in the Apostles time for preventing Schisms, must*, à fortiori, *be necessary in all succeeding ages*; but still be sure to hold to that power or jurisdiction which was in the *Apostles* times, and we grant you all you can prove from it. You still dispute gallantly, when you beg the Question, and argue as formally as I have met with one, when you have supposed that which it most concerned you to prove; Which is, that *God* hath appointed a *Supremacy of power* in one particular *person*, always to continue in the *Church* for preservation of Faith and Unity in it. For, if you suppose the *Church* cannot be governed, or *Schism* prevented without this, you may well save your self a labour of proving any further. But, so far are we from seeing such a *Supremacy of power* as you challenge to the *Pope* to be necessary for preventing *Schisms*, that we are sufficiently convinced that the *Usurping* of it hath caused one of the *greatest* ever was in the *Christian world.*

Reynolds against *Hart. c. 5. div. 3.*

Hieron. l. 1. Jovin. c. 14.

CHAP. VII.

The Popes Authority, not proved from Scripture, or Reaſon.

The inſufficiency of the proofs from Scripture acknowledged by Romaniſts themſelves. The impertinency of Luk. 22. 32. *to that purpoſe. No proofs offered for it but the ſuſpected teſtimonies of Popes in their own cauſe. That no Infallibility can thence come to the Pope as St.* Peters *ſucceſſor confeſſed and proved by* Vigorius, *and Mr.* White. *The weakneſs of the evaſion of the Popes erring as a private Doctor, but not as Pope, acknowledged by them.* John 21. 15. *proves nothing towards the Popes Supremacy. How far the Popes Authority is owned by the Romaniſts over Kings.* T. C.*'s beggings of the Queſtion, and tedious repetitions, paſt over. The Argument from the neceſſity of a living Judge, conſidered. The Government of the Church not Monarchical, but Ariſtocratical. The inconveniencies of Monarchical Government in the Church manifeſted from reaſon. No evidence that Chriſt intended to inſtitute ſuch Government in his Church, but much againſt it. The Communicatory letters in the primitive Church argued an Ariſtocracy.* Gerſons *Teſtimony from his Book* de Auferribilitate Papæ, *explained and vindicated.* St. Hieromes *Teſtimony full againſt a Monarchy in the Church. The inconſiſtency of the Popes Monarchy with that of Temporal Princes. The Supremacy of Princes in Eccleſiaſtical matters, aſſerted by the Scripture and Antiquity, as well as the Church of* England.

§. 1. WE are now come to the places of *Scripture* inſiſted on for the proof of the *Popes* Authority; which you have been ſo often and ſucceſsfully beaten out of, by ſo many powerful aſſaults of our Writers, that it is matter of admiration that you ſhould yet think to find any ſhelter there. For thoſe which you yet account *Fortreſſes* and *Bulwarks* for your cauſe, have not only been triumphed over by your Adverſaries, but have been *ſlighted* by the wiſeſt of your party, and deſerted as moſt untenable places. As I ſhall make it appear to you in the progreſs of this diſpute: In which I ſhall not barely ſhew the palpable weakneſs of your pretended proofs, but bring unanſwerable arguments againſt them from perſons of your own Communion. For the force of that reaſon by which the *Proteſtants* have prevailed over you in this diſpute hath been ſo great, that it hath brought over ſome of the learneſt of your party, not only to an acknowledgement of the inſufficiency of theſe proofs, but to a zealous oppoſition againſt that very Doctrine which you attempt to prove by them. But ſuch is the fate of a ſinking cauſe, that it catcheth hold of any thing to ſave it ſelf, though it be the *Anchor* of the Ship which makes it ſink the ſooner. Thus it will appear to be in theſe *baffled* Proofs, which you only bring into the Field to ſhew what ſtreights you are in for help; and no ſooner appear there, but they fall off to the conquering ſide, and help only to promote your ruine. But ſince they are in the place where Arguments ſhould be, we muſt in civility conſider them, as if they were ſo. The firſt place then is, Luke 22. 32. *I have pray'd for thee that thy faith fail not.* What would a *Philoſopher* think, were he choſen as *Umpire* between us, (as once one was between *Origen* and his Adverſaries) to hear this place produced to prove the *Popes Authority* and *Infallibility?* And when a reaſon is demanded of ſo ſtrange an Inference (from a promiſe of *recovery* to St. *Peter*, to an *impoſſibility* of *falling* in the *Pope*) nothing elſe produced, but the forged *Epiſtles* of ſome *Popes*, and the partial Teſtimonies of others in their own cauſe? Could he think otherwiſe, but that theſe men loved their cauſe

cauſe dearly, and would fain prove it, if they could tell how: but ſince there was neither evidence in reaſon or more indifferent writers in it, yet to let them ſee how confident they were of the *Popes Infallibility*, they would produce their *Infallible* Teſtimonies, to prove they were *Infallible*. For we ask, What evidence is there that the priviledge obtained for St. *Peter*, whatever it is, muſt deſcend to his *Succeſſors*; if to his Succeſſors, whether to *all* his Succeſſors, or only to ſome; if only to *ſome*, why to thoſe at *Rome* more than at *Antioch* or any other place; if to them at *Rome*, why it muſt be underſtood of a *Doctrinal* and not a *ſaving Faith*, as it was in St. *Peter*; if of *Doctrinal*, why not *abſolutely*, but only *conditionally*, if they teach the Church? For all theſe and ſeveral other enquiries of this nature, we are told, It muſt be ſo underſtood; but if you ask Why, all the Anſwer we can get is, *Becauſe ſeven Popes at one time or other ſaid ſo.*

But at this you grow very angry; and tell us, 1. *That* Bellarmin, *beſides theſe, gives ſeveral pregnant reaſons from the Text it ſelf.* What were it worth, to have a ſight of them! If you had thought them ſo pregnant, you are not ſo ſparing of taking out of *Bellarmin*, but you would have given them us over again. *Bellarmins* excellent proofs are two or three *ſine Dubio's*. *Sine dubio*, ſaith he, *hic Dominus ſpeciale aliquid Petro impetravit.* And who denies it? but we grant, it was ſo ſpecial to him that it never came to his Succeſſors; and again, *Sine dubio, ipſis præcipuè debeat eſſe nota ſuæ ſedis auctoritas*, ſpeaking of the *Popes Teſtimonies* for themſelves, Without all doubt they knew beſt their own Authority. They were wonderfully to blame elſe; but all the difficulty is, to perſwade others to believe them *ſine dubio*, when they ſpeak in their own Cauſe. And for that I can find no pregnant reaſon in him at all. Well, but we have a third *ſine dubio* yet, which may be more to the purpoſe than either of the other two. For *Bellarmin* diſtinguiſhes of two priviledges which Chriſt obtained for St. *Peter*, the firſt is, *That himſelf ſhould never loſe the true Faith though he were tempted of the Devil*; and this his Lordſhip grants, that it was the ſpecial grace which Chriſts prayer obtained, that, notwithſtanding Satans ſifting him, and his threefold denyal of his Maſter, he ſhould not fall into a final Apoſtaſie: The ſecond priviledge is, *That he, as Biſhop, ſhould not be able to teach any thing againſt the Faith*, ſive, ut in ſede ejus nunquam inveniretur qui doceret contra veram fidem, *or, that there ſhould be none found in his See who ſhould do it.* Is not here an excellent conjunction disjunctive in this *Sive*, Or? that he ſhould not do it *himſelf*, *or*, that his *Succeſſors* ſhould not do it? Doth not this want pregnant proofs? and we have them in the next words. *The firſt of theſe, it may be* (very modeſtly!) *did not deſcend to his Succeſſors*; *but* ſecundum, ſine Dubio, manavit ad poſteros ſive ſucceſſores; *the ſecond, without all doubt, did deſcend to his Succeſſors.* Are not theſe pregnant reaſons; *three ſine dubio's* given us by *Cardinal Ballarmin?* For when he comes to confirm this laſt *ſine dubio*, he produces nothing but thoſe Teſtimonies, which his Lordſhip excepts againſt, as not fit to be Judges in their own Cauſe. If theſe then be *Bellarmins* pregnant reaſons out of the Text, no wonder that his Lordſhip was not pleaſed to Anſwer them. But yet you are diſpleaſed, that *his Lordſhip ſhould think that Popes were intereſſed perſons in their own Cauſe.* No, no; all that ever ſat in that *See*, were ſuch holy, meek, humble, ſelf-denying men, that they would not for a world, let a word fall to exalt their own Authority in the *Church*. And we are mightily to blame to think otherwiſe of them. Is it poſſible to think that *Felix* 1, and *Lucius* 1, ſhould ſpeak for their own intereſt; though the *Epiſtles* under their names be ſuch notorious counterfeits, that all ſober men among you are aſhamed of them?

§. 2. P. 208.

Bell. de Pontif. l. 4. c. 3.

them? Is it poſſible that *Leo* 1. ſhould do it, who was ſo humble a man that he contended with 630. *Biſhops* of the *Council of Chalcedon* about the *Primacy* of his *See*; and whoſe *Epiſtles* breath ſo much of *ſelf-denyal* in all the conteſts he had about it? And although *Pope Agatho* and the reſt be of later ſtanding, when the *Popes* did begin a little more openly to take upon them; yet, Can the *Proteſtants* think that theſe men were *byaſſed* with their proper *Intereſt? Are not theſe weak pretences for them to reject their Authority upon? For your part* (you ſay,) *you could never underſtand this proceeding of Proteſtants.* The more a great deal is the pity; and if we could help your underſtanding and not endanger our own, we would willingly do it. Well, but though *Bellarmins* pregnant reaſons prove ſo abortive, and though the *Popes* Authorities ſhould not be taken, yet his Lordſhip muſt needs wrong *Bellarmin*, in ſaying, *That he doth upon the matter confeſs, that there is not one Father in the Church diſintereſſed in the Cauſe,*
P. 209. *who underſtands this Text as* Bellarmin *doth, before* Theophylact. And the reaſon is, *becauſe, though* Bellarmin *cite no more, yet there might be more for all that: for, muſt he needs confeſs, there are no more Authors citable in any ſubject, but what he cites himſelf?* As though *Bellarmin* were wont to leave oût any authorities which made for his purpoſe, eſpecially in ſo weighty a ſubject as this? Do you think he was ſo weak a perſon to run to *Popes Authorities*, if he could have found any other? and when he produces no more, is it not a plain confeſſion he found no more to his purpoſe? But I am weary of ſuch great Impertinencies: and would fain meet with ſome thing of matter that might hold up the Readers patience as well as mine. All that ever I can meet with, that hath any thing of tendency that way, is, *That this priviledge of the Indefiiciency of St.* Peters *Faith doth not belong to him as an Apoſtle, but rather as he was Prince of the Apoſtles, and appointed to be Chriſts Vicar on earth after him.* Very handſomly begged again! but where is the proof for all this? Have you no *Popes* ſtand ready again to atteſt the truth of it? For none elſe that have any reaſon would ever ſay it? did St. *Peter* deny Chriſt as *Prince* of the *Apoſtles?* Indeed it was then much for his honour that the *Captain* ſhould fly from his colours firſt? and *Chriſts Vicar upon earth* ſhould the moſt need to have his *Faith* prayed for, that it ſhould not fail? I had thought St. *Peter* had been head of the *Apoſtles*, and not *Simon:* if Chriſt had ſpoke to him as his *Vicar*, he would ſure have call'd him *Peter, Peter*, and not *Simon, Simon.* But it ſeems he did not attend, that *Peter was the Rock, on which his Church muſt be built:* or elſe he minded it ſo much, that he thought that name improper when he mentions his falling; You have therefore ſtoutly and unanſwerably (not proved, but) demonſtrated that theſe words were ſpoken of St. *Peter*, not as an *Apoſtle*, but as *Chriſts Vicar upon earth.*

§. 3. But ſuppoſe it were ſo; what is this to thoſe who pretend to be his Succeſſors? *Yes very much. For* (ſay you), *Whatever our Saviour intended ſhould deſcend by vertue of that prayer of his, did effectively ſo deſcend.* You might have put one of *Bellarmins ſine dubio's* to this. For, Whoever was ſo ſenſleſs as to queſtion that? But you confeſs, *It is a very diſputable queſtion, Whether every thing which Chriſt by his prayer intended and obtained for St.* Peter, *was likewiſe intended by him to deſcend to St.* Peters *Succeſſours. Yet that ſome ſpecial priviledge was to deſcend to them, is, you ſay, manifeſt by* Bellarmins *Authorities and Reaſons.* If from nothing elſe, I dare confidently ſay, no man in his wits will believe it manifeſt. And what that is, neither you, nor any one elſe can either prove or underſtand. *Yes* (ſay you) *it is, that none of his Succeſſors ſhould ever ſo far fall from the Faith, as to teach Hereſie*, in Pontificalibus, or, as you ſpeak with *Bellarmin, any thing contrary to Faith* tanquam Pontifex; *i. e. in vertue of that Authority*

which

which they were to have in the Church as St. Peters *Succeſſors.* Here then we fix a while to ſee this proved; but our expectation is again fruſtrated: For inſtead of proofs we meet with the old *Mumpſimus*, of the *Popes erring as private Doctor, but not as Paſtor of the Church:* A diſtinction ſo ridiculous, that many among your ſelves deride it, as will appear preſently. And therefore put in your *tanquam Pontifex* as long as you pleaſe, you will gain no great matter by it. When you can prove that Chriſt did intend in that one prayer, ſome part of the Gift *perſonally* and *abſolutely* to St. *Peter*, and another part *conditionally to his Succeſſors*, I will grant it no abſurdity to ſay, that *perhaps ſome part of the Gift did not belong to either of them.* But theſe are ſuch ſtrange fetches out of a plain *Scripture*, that thoſe may admire your ſubtilty, who cannot be convinced by your reaſon. Yet to let you ſee that theſe things are not ſo clear as you would have them, I ſhall bring you ſome Arguments out of your own Writers againſt your interpretation of this place, and I pray Anſwer them at your leiſure. *Vigorius* therefore proves that this place cannot be underſtood of St. *Peter and his Succeſſors*, that their Faith ſhould not fail; for then ſaith he. 1. *The Canons had decreed to no purpoſe that a Pope might be depoſed in caſe of Hereſie; for thoſe that ſuppoſe that he may fall into Hereſie, do doubtleſs ſuppoſe that his Faith fails.* Now here is a witneſs againſt you, from your own *Church* and that out of your *Canons* too; and that is better worth than twenty *Teſtimonies* of *Popes* for you. 2. If this were underſtood of St. *Peters Succeſſors, they who ſucceeded him at* Antioch *would enjoy this priviledge as well as thoſe at* Rome; for they are, ſaith he, as well St. *Peters* Succeſſors as the other. And, ſaith he, if they underſtand this of one and not of the other, *totis faucibus ſe deridendos propinarent*, they expoſe themſelves to contempt and laughter. 3. If this were true of St. *Peters Succeſſors at* Rome, *then the decrees of one Pope could not be revoked by the other; becauſe, it is impoſſible they ſhould err in making thoſe decrees.* But it is not *Vigorius* alone who hath ſhewed the weakneſs of your Arguments from this place; for our learned Countryman Mr. *White* hath more fully and largely diſcovered the weakneſs of all your pretences from *Scripture*, *Fathers*, and *Reaſon*, concerning the *Popes ſucceeding St.* Peter *in his Infallibility.* And particularly as to this place he ſaith, *that either it concerns the preſent danger St.* Peter *was in, or elſe doth repreſent what was to be afterwards in the Church: and that it doth primarily and directly relate to St.* Peters *imminent tentation, all the circumſtances perſwade us; firſt, becauſe he is called by his private name* Simon, *and not by his Apoſtolical name* Peter. 2. *Becauſe Chriſt immediately ſubjoyns after St.* Peters *anſwer his threefold denial of him.* 3. *The event it ſelf makes it appear, by the Apoſtles flight, St.* Peters *temptation and fall, his converſion and tears when Chriſt looked on him; and by his confirming the Diſciples after Chriſts reſurrection. But* (ſaith he,) *if this place be taken as reſpecting the future times of the Church, the ſame thing muſt be expected in St.* Peters *Succeſſors, which fell out in St.* Peter *himſelf*, viz. *that either through fear, or ſome other motive they may be drawn into the ſhew of Hereſie, or into Hereſie it ſelf; but ſo, as either in themſelves or their Succeſſors, they ſhould be reſtored to the Catholick Faith.* But what reaſon there is for this later interpretation (though deſtructive to the Popes infallibility) neither doth that perſon acquaint us, nor can I poſſibly underſtand. All the evaſion that you have to avoid the force of whatever is brought againſt you out of this place, is by conjuring up that rare diſtinction of the *Popes not erring when he defines any thing as matter of Faith.* But ſee what that ſame perſon ſaith of this diſtinction of yours, *Excipiunt aliqui*, ſaith he, *Papam poſſe eſſe hæreticum, ſed non poſſe hæreſim promulgare. Adeò quidlibet effutire pro libidine, etiam licitum eſt.* Some *Anſwer, that the*

P. 219.

Comment. in 7. Synod. Concil. Baſil. c. 7. ſect. 3.

Tibulæ ſuffr. tab. 19. p. 112.

Tabul. ſuffrag. p. 145.

Pope

Pope may be a Heretick, but cannot promulge or define Hereſie: So far do men think it lawful to ſay what they pleaſe. But can any man, ſaith he, *be guilty of ſo much incogitancy, as not to ſee that theſe things are conſequent upon each other; It is a Pear tree, and therefore it will bear Pears: It is a Vine, and therefore it will bring forth Grapes. Chriſt ſaith, An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit; but theſe ſay, An evil tree cannot bring forth bad fruit. The Apoſtle ſaith, The wiſdom of the Fleſh cannot be ſubject to God; but theſe ſay, It cannot but be ſubject to God.* And then he further preſſeth, *That they would declare from what Author they brought this contradiction into the Church of God, leſt men ſhould believe they were inſpired by the Father of lyes when they made it.* Nay he goes further yet in theſe ſtinging expreſſions, *An putatis licere, in re quæ totum Eccleſiæ ſtatum ad vivum tangit, novitatem adeò inauditam, adeò rationi adverſantem, adeò excedentem omnem fidem, ex ſomniis cerebri veſtri inferre? Do you think it lawful, in a matter which toucheth the whole ſtate of the Church to the quick, to produce ſo unheard of a novelty, ſo repugnant to reaſon, ſo far above all Faith, out of the dreams of your own brain?* Go now, and anſwer theſe things among your ſelves; complain not that we account ſuch evaſions ſilly, abſurd, and ridiculous; you ſee they are accounted ſo by ſome of your own Communion (or, at leaſt, who pretend to be ſo) and thoſe no contemptible perſons neither. But ſuch as have ſeen ſo much of the weakneſs and abſurdity of your common doctrine, that they openly and confidently oppoſe it, and that upon the ſame grounds that *Proteſtants* had done it before them. And I hope, this is much more to our purpoſe to ſhew the inſufficiency of theſe proofs, than it was for you to produce the Teſtimonies of ſeveral *Popes* in their own Cauſe. Which was all the proof that *Bellarmin* or you had, that theſe words are extended to St. *Peters Succeſſors*, when we bring men from among your ſelves, who produce ſeveral reaſons, that they ought not to be ſo interpreted.

§. 4. P. 211. P. 191. But yet there is another place as pertinent as the former; the celebrated *Paſce oves & agnos*, John 21. 15, 16, 17. *But ſheep and Lambs*, ſay you, *are Chriſts whole flock. So there are both theſe*, ſaith his Lordſhip, *in every flock that is not of barren Wethers; and every Apoſtle, and every Apoſtles ſucceſſor hath charge to feed both Sheep and Lambs; that is, weaker and ſtronger Chriſtians, not people and Paſtors, ſubjects and Governours, as* A. C. *expounds it, to bring the necks of Princes under the Roman Pride. No* (ſay you,) *no ſuch charge is given to any other Apoſtles, in the places his Lordſhip cites,* Matth. 28. 19. Matth. 10. 17. *for theſe ſpeak of perſons unbaptized, but that place of St.* John, *of thoſe who were actually Chriſts Flock; and the words being abſolutely and indefinitely pronounced, muſt be underſtood generally and indefinitely of all Chriſts Sheep and Lambs, that is, of all Chriſtians whatſoever, not excepting the Apoſtles themſelves; unleſs it appear from ſome other place, that the other Apoſtles had the feeding of all Chriſts Sheep, as univerſally and unlimitedly committed to them, as they were here to St.* Peter. But all this is nothing, as *Vigorius* ſpeaks about the *ſolvere, ligare, paſcere,* Vigor. p. 61. but *dudum exploſis cantilenis aures Chriſtianorum obtundere*, to bring us thoſe things over and over, which have been anſwered as oft as they have been brought. For how often have you been told, that theſe words contain no particular *Commiſſion* to St. *Peter*, but a more vehement *exhortation* to the diſcharge of his duty, and that preſſed with the quickneſs of the queſtion before it, *Loveſt thou me?* How often, that the full *Com-* John 20. 21. *miſſion* to the *Apoſtles* was given before? *As the Father hath ſent me, ſo ſend I you.* And that, as Chriſt was by his Fathers appointment the chief *Shepheard* of the *Sheep* and *Lambs* too; ſo Chriſt by this equal Commiſſion to all the *Apoſtles* gives them all an equal power and authority to govern his

Flock:

Flock: How often, that nothing appears conſequent upon this, whereby St. *Peter* took this office upon him? but that afterwards we find St. *Peter* call'd the *Apoſtle of the Circumciſion*, which certainly he would never have been, had he been looked on as the *Univerſal Paſtor of the Church*; we find the *Apoſtles* ſending St. *Peter* to *Samaria*, which was a very unmannerly action, if they looked on him as *Head of the Church*. How often, that theſe indefinite expreſſions are not excluſive of the *Paſtoral charge* of other *Apoſtles* over the *Flock* of *Chriſt?* when they are not only bid *to preach the Goſpel to every creature*, but even thoſe *Biſhops* which they ordained in ſeveral *Churches* are charged to *feed the Flock*; and therefore certainly the *Apoſtles* themſelves had not only a charge to Preach to unbaptized perſons (as you ſuppoſe) but to govern the *Flock* of thoſe who were actually *Chriſts Sheep and Lambs*, as well as St. *Peter?* How often, I ſay, have you been told all theſe and ſeveral other things in Anſwer to this place; and have you yet the confidence to object it, as though it had never been taken notice of, without ever offering to take off thoſe Anſwers which have been ſo frequently given? But you muſt be pardoned in this, as in all other things of an equal Impoſſibility.

Gal. 2. 7. Acts 8. 14. Mark 6. 16. Acts 20. 28.

§. 5. Well, but his Lordſhip objects a ſhrewd Conſequence from this Univerſal Paſtorſhip; *that this brings the necks of Princes under the Roman Pride. And if Kings be meant*, (his Lordſhip ſaith) *yet the command is*, paſce, *feed them*; *but* deponere, *or* occidere, *to depoſe or kill them, is not* paſcere *in any ſenſe*; Lanii id eſt, non Paſtoris, *that's the Butchers, not the Shepheards part. This*, you call, *his Lordſhips winding about, and falling upon that odious Queſtion of killing and depoſing Kings.* An odious Queſtion indeed, whether we conſider the grounds, or the effects and conſequents of it. But yet you would ſeem to clear your ſelves from the *odium* of it. *Firſt, By ſaying that it is a groſs fallacy to argue* à negatione ſpeciei ad negationem generis, *which is a new kind of Logick.* It is indeed, for it is of your own coyning; for his Lordſhip argues *ab affirmatione generis ad affirmationem ſpeciei*, and I hope this is no new *Logick*, unleſs you think he that ſaith, He who hath power over all *living creatures*, hath not thereby power over *men* too. His Lordſhip therefore doth not argue againſt the *Popes Univerſal Supremacy* from the *denyal* of that, but deduces that as a *conſequence* from your aſſertion, and explication of what you mean by *Sheep and Lambs*. But this is but a ſleight Anſwer in compariſon of what follows; *Secondly, we anſwer, That the point of Killing Kings, is a moſt falſe and ſcandalous Imputation*; ſcandalous enough indeed, if falſe: and though your *Popes* have not given expreſs warrant for the doing it, yet it is ſufficiently known, How the *Pope* in Conſiſtory could not contain his joy when it was done, in the caſe of *Henry* 3. of *France*. And it hath been ſufficiently confeſſed and lamented by *perſons* of your own communion, How much the Doctrine of the *Jeſuits* hath encouraged thoſe *Aſſaſſinations* of thoſe two ſucceſſive *Henryes* of *France*. Will you, or dare you vindicate the Doctrines of *Mariana*, and others, which do not obſcurely deliver their judgement, as to that very thing of *Killing Heretical Princes?* But, if we ſhould grant you this, That the *Pope may not command to kill*, What ſay you to that of *depoſing Princes*; which ſeldom falls much ſhort of the other? As to this, you dare not cry, It is a falſe and ſcandalous imputation, as you did to the other; but you anſwer, *'Tis no point of your Faith, that the Pope hath power to do it; and therefore you ſay it is no part of your task to diſpute it.* Is this all the ſecurity *Princes* have from you, that it is no point of your Faith, that the *Pope* hath power to do it? Is it not well enough known, that there are many things which are held undoubtedly by the greateſt part of your *Church*, which

P. 191. Ibid. P. 212.

which yet you ſay, are no points of Faith? And yet in this you are directly contradicted by one who knew what were points of *Faith* among you, as well as you, and that was *Father Creſwell*; whoſe teſtimony I have cited already; and he ſaith expreſly, *Certum eſt, & de fide*, It is a thing certain, and of Faith: *that the ſubjects of an Heretical Prince, are not only freed from Allegiance, but are bound*, ex hominum Chriſtianorum dominatu ejicere, *to caſt him out of his power*, which certainly is more than the depoſing of him. And *Sanders* plainly enough ſaith, *That a King that will not ſubmit to the Popes Authority, is by no means to be ſuffered, but his ſubjects ought to do their utmoſt endeavour that another may be placed in his room.* Indeed, he ſaith not, as the other doth, That this is *de fide*, but that is the only reſerve you have when a Doctrine is odious and infamous to the world, to cry out, It is not *de fide*, when yet it may be as firmly believed among you, as any that you account *de fide*. And if you believe the *Duke* of *Alva* in his *Manifeſto* at the ſiege of *Pampelona*, when the *Pope* had depoſed the *King* of *Navarre* to whom that City belonged, he ſaith, *That it is not doubted but the Pope had power to depoſe Heretical Princes.* And if you had been of another opinion, you ought to have declared your ſelf more fully than you do. If you had ſaid, that indeed ſome were of that opinion, but you abhorred and deteſted it, you had ſpoken to the purpoſe; but when you uſe only that pitiful evaſion, *That it is not of Faith*, &c. you ſufficiently ſhew, What your judgement is, but that you dare not publickly own it. It ſeems, you remember what was ſaid by your Maſters in reference to *Emanuel Sà*, *Non fuit opus ad iſta deſcendere*, There was no need to meddle with thoſe things. It ſeems, if there had been, there was no hurt in the Doctrine, but only that it was unſeaſonable. I pray *God* keep us from that time, when you ſhall think it *needful* to declare your ſelves in this point. But you conclude this with a moſt unworthy and ſcandalous reflection on *Proteſtants*, in theſe words; *But what Proteſtants have both done and juſtified in the worſt of theſe kinds, is but too freſh in memory.* But, Were thoſe the practices and principles of *Proteſtants?* Were they not abhorred and deteſted in the higheſt manner by all *true Proteſtants*, both at *home* and *abroad?* It will be well, if you can clear ſome of your ſelves from having too much a hand in promoting both thoſe principles and practices. I ſuppoſe you cannot but have heard, Who it was is ſaid to have expreſſed ſo much joy at the time of that horrid execution; What counſels and machinations are ſaid to have been among ſome devoted Sons of the *Church* of *Rome* abroad about that time: Therefore clear your ſelves more than yet you have done, of thoſe imputations, before you charge that guilt on *Proteſtants*, which they expreſs the higheſt abhorrence of. And let the names of ſuch who either publickly or privately abett or juſtifie ſuch horrid actions, be under a continual *Anathema* to all *Generations*.

Elegiam. ſect. 157. p. 147.

De viſib. Monarch. l. 2. c. 4.

Nebriſſenſ. de bello Navarr. l. 1. c. 6.

§. 6. After all this diſcourſe about the *Popes Authority*, *A. C.* brings it at laſt home to the buſineſs of *Schiſm*. For, he ſaith, *The Biſhop of* Rome *ſhall never refuſe to feed and govern the whole Flock in ſuch ſort, as that neither particular man nor Church ſhall have juſt cauſe, under pretence of Reformation in matters of Faith, to make a ſeparation from the whole Church. This* (his Lordſhip ſaith) *by* A. C.*'s favour is meer begging the Queſtion. For this is the very thing which the Proteſtants charge upon him; namely, that he hath governed, if not the whole, yet ſo much of the Church as he hath been able to bring under his power, ſo as that he hath given too juſt cauſe of the preſent continued Separation. And, as the corruptions in the Doctrine of Faith, in the Church of* Rome, *were the cauſe of the firſt Separation; ſo are they at this preſent day the cauſe why the Separation continues. And the oppreſſion of the Church*

P. 191. n. 18.

Church of Rome, he further adds, *is the great cauſe of all the errors in that part of the Church which is under the Roman Juriſdiction. And for the Proteſtants, they have made no ſeparation from the General Church properly ſo called, but their Separation is only from the Church of* Rome, *and ſuch other Churches as by adhering to her, have hazarded themſelves, and do now miſcall themſelves the whole Catholick Church. Nay, even here the Proteſtants have not left the Church of* Rome *in her eſſence, but in her errors; not in the things which conſtitute a Church, but only in ſuch abuſes and corruptions, as work towards the diſſolution of a Church.* Let now any indifferent Reader be judge, Whether his Lordſhip, or *A. C.* be the more guilty *in begging the Queſtion.* For all the Anſwer you can give, is, *That his Lordſhip begs it, in ſaying that the Roman Church is not the whole Catholick Church, and that the Roman Catholick Church may be in an error*; but the former we have proved already, and I doubt not but the latter will be as evident as the other, before our task be ended. But, as though it were not poſſible for you to be guilty of *begging the Queſtion*, after you have ſaid that the *Roman Church cannot err*, you give this as the reaſon for it, *Becauſe ſhe is the unſhaken Rock of Truth*; *and that ſhe hath the ſole continual ſucceſſion of lawfully-ſent Paſtors and Teachers, who have taught the ſame unchanged Doctrine, and ſhall infallibly continue ſo teaching it to the worlds end.* Now, Who dares call this *Begging the Queſtion?* No, it muſt not be called ſo in you, it ſhall be only *Taking it for granted.* Which we have ſeen, hath been your practice all along, eſpecially when we charge your *Church* with error; for then you cry out preſently, What, *your Church err?* No, you defie the language. What, *the Spouſe of Chriſt, the Catholick Church err?* that is impoſſible. What, the *unſhaken Rock of Truth* to ſink into errors? the *Infallible Church* be deceived? ſhe that hath never taught any thing but Truth, be charged with falſhood? ſhe, that not only *never did err*, but, it is *impoſſible*, nay, utterly *impoſſible*, nay, ſo *impoſſible*, that it *cannot be imagined*, that ever *ſhe ſhould err?* This is the ſum of all your arguments, which, no doubt, ſound high to all ſuch who know not what confident begging the Queſtion means, or, out of modeſty, are loth to charge you with it. P. 212.

Much to the ſame purpoſe do you go on, to prove, *that Proteſtants have ſeparated not from the errors, but the eſſence of your Church.* And if that be true, which you ſay, *That thoſe things which we call Errors are eſſential to your Church*, we are the more ſorry for it; for we are ſure, (and, when you pleaſe, will prove it) that they are not, cannot be, eſſential to a *true Church*; and if they be to yours, the caſe is ſo much the worſe with you, when your diſtempers are in your vitals, and your errors eſſential to your *Churches Conſtitution.* What other things you have here, are the bare repetitions of what we have often had before in the *Chapters* you refer us to. And here we may thank you for ſome eaſe you give us in the far greateſt remaining part of this *Chapter*, which conſiſts of tedious repetitions of ſuch things which have been largely diſcuſſed in the *Firſt part*, where they were purpoſely and deſignedly handled; as that concerning *Traditions, chap. 6.* that *concerning neceſſaries to ſalvation, chap. 2, 3, 4.* that concerning the *Scriptures being an Infallible Rule*, throughout the Controverſie of *Reſolution of Faith*; and that which concerns *the Infallibility of General Councils*, we ſhall have occaſion at large to handle afterwards; and if there be any thing material here, which you omit there, it ſhall be fully conſidered. But I know no obligation lying upon me to anſwer things as often as you repeat them, eſpecially ſince your gift is ſo good that way. It is ſufficient that I know not of any material paſſage, which hath not received an Anſwer in its proper place. N. 6. N. 8. N. 57.

§. 7. That which is moſt pertinent to our preſent purpoſe, is that which concerns *the neceſſity of a Living Judge, beſides the Scriptures for ending Controverſies of Faith.* P. 198. n. 6. As to which his Lordſhip ſaith, *That, ſuppoſing there were ſuch a one, and the Pope were he, yet that is not ſufficient againſt the malice of the Devil, and impious men, to keep the Church at all times from renting even in the Doctrine of Faith, or to ſoder the Rents which are made. For,* oportet eſſe Hæreſes, 1 Cor. 11. 19. *Hereſies there will be, and Hereſies there properly cannot be but in the Doctrine of Faith.* P. 218. To this you anſwer, *That Hereſies are not within, but without the Church, and the Rents which ſtand in need of ſodering, are not found among the true members of the Church, who continue ſtill united in the Faith, and due obedience to their Head; but in thoſe who have deſerted the true Church, and either made or adhered to Schiſmatical and Heretical Congregations.* A moſt excellent Anſwer! His Lordſhip ſays, If Chriſt had appointed an *Infallible Judge* beſides the *Scripture,* certainly it ſhould have been for preventing *Hereſies,* and ſodering the Rents of the *Church. So it is* (ſay you) *for if there be any Hereſies, it is nothing to him, they are out of the Church; and if there be any Schiſms, they are among thoſe who are divided from him:* That is, he is an *Infallible Judge* only thus far, in condemning all ſuch for *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks,* who do not own him. And his only way of preventing *Hereſies* and *Schiſms,* is the making this the only tryal of them, that whatever queſtions his *Authority,* is *Hereſie*; and whatever ſeparation be made from him, is *Schiſm.* Juſt as *Abſalom* pretended that there was no *Judge* appointed *to hear and determine cauſes,* 2 Sam. 15. 2. and that the *Laws* were not ſufficient without one, and therefore he would do it himſelf; ſo doth the *Pope* by *Chriſt,* he pretends that he hath not taken care ſufficient for deciding Controverſies in Faith, therefore there is a neceſſity in order to the Churches *Unity,* he ſhould take it upon himſelf. But now, if we ſuppoſe in the former caſe of *Abſalom,* that he had pretended he could infallibly end all the Controverſies in *Iſrael,* and keep all in peace and unity; and yet abundance of Controverſies to ariſe among them *by what right and power he took that office upon him,* and many of them cry out upon it, as an *Uſurpation,* and a diſparagement to the *Laws* and *Government* of his *Father David*; and upon this, ſome of the wiſer *Iſraelites* ſhould have asked him, Whether this were the way to end all *Controverſies,* and keep the Nation in peace? Would it not have been a ſatisfactory Anſwer for him to have ſaid, Yes, no doubt it is the only way; *For, only they that acknowledge my power, are the Kings lawful ſubjects, and all the reſt are Rebels and Traytors.* And, Is not this juſt the ſame Anſwer which you give here? *That the Pope is ſtill appointed to keep peace and unity in the Church, becauſe all that queſtion his Authority, be Hereticks and Schiſmaticks.* But, as in the former caſe, the ſureſt way to prevent thoſe Conſequences, were to produce that power and authority which the *King* had given him, and that ſhould be the firſt thing which ſhould be made evident from authentick records, and the clear teſtimony of the graveſt *Senators*; ſo, if you could produce the *Letters Patents,* whereby *Chriſt* made the *Pope* the great *Lord Chancellor* of his *Church,* to determine all *Controverſies* of *Faith,* and ſhew this atteſted by the concurrent voice of the *Primitive Church,* who beſt knew what order Chriſt took for the Government of his *Church*; this were a way to prevent ſuch perſons turning ſuch *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks,* as you ſay they are, by not ſubmitting themſelves to the *Popes Authority.* But for you to pretend that the *Popes Authority* is neceſſary to the *Churches Unity,* and when the *Hereſies* and *Schiſms* of the *Church* are objected, to ſay, That thoſe are all out of the *Church,* is juſt as if a *Shepheard* ſhould ſay, That he would keep the *whole Flock* of *Sheep* within ſuch a *Fold,* and when the better half are

ſhewed

ſhewed him to be out of it, he ſhould return this Anſwer, That thoſe were without, and not within his Fold; and therefore they were none of the *Flock* that he meant. So that his meaning was, *thoſe that would abide in, he could keep in, but for thoſe that would not, he had nothing to ſay to them.* So it is with you, the *Pope* he ends Controverſies, and keeps the *Church* at *Unity*; How ſo? They who do agree, are of his *Flock*, and of the *Church*; and thoſe that do not, are out of it. A *Quaker* or *Anabaptiſt* will keep the *Church in Unity* after the ſame way, only the *Pope* hath the greater number of his ſide; for, they will tell you, If they were hearkened to, the *Church* ſhould never be in *pieces*; for all thoſe who embrace their *Doctrines*, are of the *Church*, and thoſe who do not, are *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*. So we ſee upon your principles, What an eaſie matter it is to be an *Infallible Judge*, and to end all *Controverſies* in the *Church*; that only this muſt be taken for granted, that all who will not own ſuch an *infallible Judge*, are out of the *Church*, and ſo the *Church* is at *Unity* ſtill, how many ſoever there are who doubt or deny the *Popes Authority*. Thus we eaſily underſtand what that excellent harmony is, which you cry ſo much up in your *Church*; that you moſt gravely ſay, *That, had not the Pope received from God the power he challenges, he could never have been able to preſerve that peace and unity in matters of Religion, that is found in the Roman Church*: Of what nature that Unity is, we have ſeen already: And ſurely you have much cauſe to boaſt of the *Popes* faculty of deciding Controverſies, ever ſince the late *Decree* of *Pope Innocent*, in the caſe of the *five Propoſitions*. For, How readily the *Janſeniſts* have ſubmitted ſince, and what Unity there hath been among the diſſenting parties in *France*, all the world can bear you witneſs. And, whatever you pretend, *were it not for Policy and Intereſt*, the Infallible Chair would ſoon fall to the ground; for it hath ſo little footing in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, that there had need be a watchful eye, and ſtrong hand to keep it up.

§. 8. But now we are to examine the main proof which is brought for the neceſſity of this *Living and Infallible Judge*; which lies in theſe words of *A. C. Every earthly Kingdom, when matters cannot be compoſed by a Parliament (which cannot be called upon all occaſions) hath, beſides the Law-Books, ſome living Magiſtrates and Judges, and above all one viſible King, the higheſt Judge, who hath Authority ſufficient to end all Controverſies, and ſettle Unity in all Temporal Affairs. And, Shall we think that Chriſt, the wiſeſt King, hath provided in his Kingdom the Church, only the Law-Books of holy Scripture, and no living viſible Judges, and above all one chief, ſo aſſiſted by his Spirit, as may ſuffice to end all Controverſies for Unity and Certainty of Faith? which can never be, if every man may interpret Holy Scripture, the Law-Books, as he liſt. This,* his Lordſhip ſaith, *is a very plauſible argument with the many; but the Foundation of it is but a ſimilitude, and, if the ſimilitude hold not in the main argument, is nothing.* And ſo his Lordſhip at large proves that it is here. For whatever further concerns this Controverſie concerning the *Popes Authority*, is brought under the examination of this argument; which you mangle into *ſeveral Chapters*, thereby confounding the *Reader*, that he may not ſee the coherence or dependence of one thing upon another. But having cut off the ſuperfluities of this *Chapter* already, I may with more conveniency reduce all that belongs to this matter within the compaſs of it. And that he may the better apprehend his Lordſhips ſcope and deſign, I ſhall firſt ſum up his Lordſhips Anſwers together, and then more particularly go about the vindication of them.

P. 199. n 7.

1. Then, his Lordſhip at large proves that the *Militant Church is not properly a Monarchy*, and therefore the foundation of the ſimilitude is deſtroyed. 2. *That ſuppoſing it a Kingdom, yet the Church Militant is ſpread in ma-*

ny earthly Kingdoms, and cannot well be ordered like one particular Kingdom. 3. *That the Church of* England *under one Supreme Governour, our Gracious Soveraign, hath, beſides the Law-Book of the Scripture, viſible Magiſtrates and Judges, Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops to govern the Church in Truth and Peace.* 4. *That as in particular Kingdoms there are ſome affairs of greateſt Conſequence as concerning the Statute Laws, which cannot be determined but in Parliament; ſo in the Church, the making ſuch Canons which muſt bind all Chriſtians, muſt belong to a free and lawful General Council.* Thus I have laid together the ſubſtance of his Lordſhips Anſwer, that the dependence and connexion of things may be better perceived by the intelligent Reader.

We come now therefore to the firſt Anſwer. As to which his Lordſhip
P. 200. ſaith, *It is not certain that the whole Church Militant is a Kingdom; for they are no mean ones which think, our Saviour Chriſt left the Church-Militant in the hands of the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors, in an Ariſtocratical, or rather a mixt Government; and that the Church is not Monarchical, otherwiſe than the Triumphant and Militant make one body under Chriſt the Head. And in this ſenſe indeed, and in this only the Church is a moſt abſolute Kingdom. And the very expreſſing of this ſenſe, is a full Anſwer to all the places of Scripture, and other arguments brought by* Bellarmin *to prove that the Church is a Monarchy. But the Church being as large as the world, Chriſt thought fitteſt to govern it Ariſtocratically, by divers, rather than by one Vice-Roy. And I believe,* ſaith he, *this is true. For ſo it was governed for the firſt three hundred years, and ſomewhat better; the Biſhops of thoſe times carrying the whole buſineſs of admitting any new conſecrated Biſhops or others to, or rejecting them from, their Communion.* And this, his Lordſhip ſaith, *He hath carefully examined for the firſt ſix hundred years even to, and within, the time of S.* Gregory *the Great.* Now to this you anſwer. 1. *That though* A. C. *urgeth the*
P. 219. *argument in a ſimilitude of a Kingdom only, yet it is of force in any other kind of ſettled Government, as in a Common-wealth.* But by this *A. C.* ſeems a great deal the wiſer man, for he knew what he did when he inſtanced in a *Kingdom*; for he foreſaw that this only would tend to his purpoſe concerning the *Popes Supremacy*; but though there be the ſame neceſſity of ſome *Supreme Power* in a *Common-wealth*, yet that would do him no good at all, for all that could be inferred thence, would be the neceſſity of a *General Council.* And by this you may ſee, How little your ſimilitude will hold any other way than *A. C.* put it. Therefore, 2. You anſwer, *That the Government of the Church is not a pure, but a mixt Monarchy,* i. e. *the Supream Government of the Church is clearly Monarchical, you confeſs: yet Biſhops within their reſpective Dioceſes and Juriſdictions are ſpiritual Princes alſo, that is, chief Paſtors and Governors of ſuch a part of the Church in their own right.* How far this latter is conſonant to your principles, I have already examined, but the former is that we diſpute now, concerning the *Supreme Government of the Church*, Whether that be *Monarchical* or no, and this is that which his Lordſhip denies; and, for all that I ſee, we may continue to do ſo too, for any argument you bring to the contrary.

§. 9. Although you produce your *Achilles* in the next paragraph, *viz. that*
P. 220. *ſince the Government of one in chief, is by all Philoſophers acknowledged for the moſt perfect, What wonder is it that Chriſt our Saviour thought it fitter to govern the Church by one Vice-Roy, than Ariſtocratically, or by many, as he would have it?* But, Are you ſure Chriſt asked the *Philoſophers* opinions, in eſtabliſhing a Government in the *Church?* The *Philoſophers* judged truly that of all *Forms* of Civil Government, *Monarchy* was the beſt, *i. e.* moſt conducing to the *ends* of Civil Government: for the *excellency* of ſuch things muſt be meaſured by their reſpect to the *ends.* Now, if we apply this

this to the *Church*, we muſt not meaſure it by ſuch *ends*, as we fancy to our ſelves, or ſuch as are only the ends of meer Civil Societies; but all muſt be conſidered with a reſpect to the chief *deſign* of him who firſt inſtituted a *Church*. And from thence we muſt draw our Inferences, as to what may tend moſt to the *Peace* and *Unity* of it. Now it appearing to be the great deſign of *Chriſt*, that mankind ſhould be brought to eternal Happineſs, we cannot argue from hence, as to the neceſſity of any manner of *Government*, unleſs one of them hath in it ſelf a greater tendency to this than another hath. For in Civil Governments, the whole deſign of the *Society*, is the *Civil Peace* of it; but it is otherwiſe in the *Church*, the main end of it, is to order things with the greateſt conveniency for a *future life*: Now this being the main end of this Society, and no manner of *Government* having in it ſelf a greater tendency to this than other; It was in the power of the *Legiſlator*, to appoint what *Government* he pleaſed himſelf. But when we conſider that he intended this *Church* of his ſhould be ſpread all over the world, and this to be his immediate errand he ſent his *Apoſtles* upon, *to preach to every creature*, and to plant *Churches* in the moſt remote and diſtant places from each other; we can have the leaſt ground to fancy he ſhould appoint an *Univerſal Monarchy* in his *Church* of any Government whatſoever. For if we will take that boldneſs you put us upon, to enquire, What form is fitteſt for a *Society* diſperſed into all *parts* of the *world*, and that are not bound, upon their being *Chriſtians*, to live nearer *Rome*, than *Mexico* or *Japan*; Could any one imagine it would be, to appoint one *Vice-Roy* to ſuperintend his *Church* at ſuch a place as *Rome* is? Suppoſe all the *Eaſt* and *Weſt-Indies* conſiſted of Chriſtian *Churches*; What advantage, in order to the Government of thoſe *Churches*, could the *Popes Authority* be? What *Hereſies* and *Schiſms* might be among them before his *Holineſs* could be acquainted with them? Theſe are therefore very ſlender and narrow Conceptions concerning *Chriſts Inſtitution* of a *Government* over his *Catholick Church*, as though he ſhould only have regard to theſe few adjacent parts of *Europe*, without any reſpect to the good of the whole Church. But ſince we ſee, *Chriſt* deſigned ſuch a *Church* which might be in moſt remote and diſtant places from each other, and yet at ſuch a diſtance might equally promote the main ends, wherefore they became Churches, it is very unreaſonable to think he ſhould appoint one *Vice-Roy* to be *Head* over them all. For which, let us ſuppoſe, that *Europe* might be (as the *Eaſtern Churches* have been) over-run with the *Turkiſh* Power, and only ſome few ſuffering *Chriſtians* left here, and the *Pope* much in the ſame condition with the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*: But on the other ſide, that *Chriſtianity* ſhould largely ſpread it ſelf in *China*, and the *Eaſt Indies*, and the *Chriſtian Church* flouriſh in *America*, Could any *Philoſopher* think that fixing a *Monarchy* at *Rome*, or elſewhere, were the beſt way to *Govern* the *Catholick Church*, which conſiſts of all theſe *Chriſtian Societies*? For that is certainly the beſt *Government* which is ſuited to all conditions of that *Society*, which it is intended for; now it is apparent the *Chriſtian Church* was intended to be ſo *Catholick*, that no one *Vice-Roy* can be ſuppoſed able to look to the *Government* of it. If Chriſt had intended meerly ſuch a *Church* which ſhould have conſiſted of ſuch perſons which lay here near about *Rome*, and no others, the ſuppoſition of ſuch a Monarchy in the *Church* would not have been altogether ſo incongruous (though liable to very many inconveniencies:) but when he intended his *Religion* for the univerſal good of the world, and that in all parts of it, without obliging them to live near each other, it is one of the moſt unreaſonable ſuppoſitions in the world, that he ſhould ſet up a *Monarchical Government* over his *Catholick Church* in ſuch a place as *Rome* is.

is. But now, if we ſuppoſe only an *Ariſtocratical Government* in the *Church* under *Chriſt* as the alone *Supreme Head*; nothing can be more ſuitable to the nature of the *Church*, or the large extent of it, than that is. For where-ever a *Church* is, there may be *Biſhops* to govern it, and other Officers of the *Church* to over-ſee the leſſer parts of it, and all joyn to promote the Peace and Unity of it, which they may with the more eaſe do, if no one challenge to be *Supreme Head*, to whom belongs the chief care of the Church. For by this means they cannot with that power and authority redreſs abuſes, and preſerve the *Churches Purity* and *Peace*, which otherwiſe they might have done. So that conſidering barely the nature of things, nothing ſeems more repugnant to the end for which Chriſt inſtituted a *Catholick Church*, than ſuch a *Monarchy* as you imagine; and nothing more ſuitable than an *Ariſtocracy*; conſidering that *Chriſtian Churches* may be much diſperſed abroad, and that where they are, they are incorporated into that Civil Society in which they live (according to the known ſaying of *Optatus*, *Eccleſia eſt in republicâ*, &c.) and therefore ſuch a *Monarchy* would be unſuitable to the civil *Governments* in which thoſe *Churches* may be. For it were eaſie to demonſtrate, that ſuch a *Monarchy* as you challenge in the *Church*, is the moſt inconvenient *Government* for it, take the *Church* in what way, or ſenſe you pleaſe; Whether, as to its own peace and order, or to its ſpreading into other *Churches*, or to the reſpect it muſt have to the Civil Government it lives under. And, if we would more largely enquire into theſe things, we might eaſily find, that thoſe which you look on as the great ends, wherefore Chriſt ſhould inſtitute ſuch a Monarchical Government in his *Church*, are things unſuitable to the nature of a *Chriſtian Church*; and which Chriſt, as far as we can judge, did never intend to take care, that they ſhould never be: which are, freedom from all kind of *Controverſies*, and abſolute ſubmiſſion of *Judgement* to the decrees of an *Infallible Judge*. We no where find ſuch a ſtate of a *Chriſtian Church* deſcribed or promiſed, where men ſhall all be of one mind (only that peace and brotherly love be continued, is that, all Chriſtians are bound to;) much leſs certainly, that this *Unity* ſhould be by a ſubmiſſion of our underſtandings to an *Infallible Judge*, of whom we read nothing in that Book which perſwades us to be *Chriſtians:* and without which freedom of our underſtandings (which this pretended Infallibility would deprive us of) we could never have been judicious and rational *Chriſtians*.

§. 10. But granting that wiſe men have thought *Monarchy the beſt Government in it ſelf*; What is this to the proving, what *Government Chriſt hath appointed in his Church?* For that is the beſt Government for the *Church*, not which *Philoſophers* and *Politicians* have thought beſt, but which our *Saviour* hath appointed in his Word. For he certainly knew beſt, what would ſuit with the conveniences of his *Church*. And theſe are bold and inſolent diſputes, wherein thoſe of your ſide argue, *That Chriſt muſt have inſtituted a Monarchy in his Church, becauſe all Philoſophers have judged That the moſt perfect Government*. I need not tell you what theſe ſpeeches imply *Chriſt* to be, if he doth not follow the *Philoſophers* judgement. Will you give him leave to judge what is fitteſt for his *Church* himſelf? or do you think he hath not wiſdom enough to do it, unleſs the *Philoſophers* inſtruct him? Let us therefore appeal to his *Laws* to ſee what *Government* he hath there appointed. And now I ſhall deal more cloſely with you. You tell me, *therein Chriſt hath appointed this Monarchical Government*. But I may be nearer your mind, when you will Anſwer me theſe following Queſtions. When, and where did any wiſe *Legiſlator* appoint a matter of ſo vaſt concernment to the good of the *Society*, as the *Supreme Government*

vernment of it, and expreſs no more of it in his *Laws*, than *Chriſt* hath done of this *Monarchical Government* of the *Church*? Is there not particular care taken in all Laws about that, to expreſs the *rights* of *Soveraignty*, to hinder *Uſurpations*, to bind all to obedience, to determine the way of Succeſſion by deſcent or election? And hath *Chriſt* inſtituted a *Monarchy* in his *Church* and ſaid nothing of all theſe things? When the utmoſt you can pretend to, are ſome ambiguous places, which you muſt have the power of Interpreting your *ſelves*, or they ſignifie nothing to your purpoſe. So that none of the *Fathers*, or the *Primitive Church* for ſeveral *Centuries*, could find out ſuch myſteries in *ſuper hanc Petram*, *dabo tibi Claves*, and *paſce oves*, as you have done. If ſuch a *Monarchy* had been appointed in the *Church*, what ſhould we have had more frequent mention of in the *Records* of the *Church*, than of this? Where do we meet with any *Hiſtories* that write the affairs of *Kingdoms* for ſome hundreds of years, and never mention any *Royal Acts* of the *Kings* of them? If S. *Peters* being at *Rome* had ſetled the *Monarchy* of the *Church* there, what more famous act could have been mentioned in all *Antiquity* than that? What notice would have been taken by other *Churches* of *him* whom he had left his Succeſſor? What addreſſes would have been made to him by the *Biſhops* of other *Churches*? What teſtimonies of obedience and ſubmiſſion; what appeals and reſort thither? And it is wonderful ſtrange that the *Hiſtories* of the *Church* ſhould be ſilent in theſe grand Affairs, when they report many minute things even during the hotteſt times of perſecution. Did the Chriſtians conſpire together in thoſe times not to let their poſterity know, Who had the *Supream Government* of the *Church* then? Or were they afraid the *Heathen Emperors* ſhould be jealous of the *Popes*, if they had underſtood their great Authority? But then methinks they ſhould have carried it however among themſelves with all reverence and ſubmiſſion to the Pope, and not openly oppoſe him aſſoon as ever he began to exerciſe any Authority, as in the caſe of *Victor* and the *Aſian Biſhops*. But of all things, it ſeems moſt ſtrange and unaccountable to me, that *Chriſt* ſhould have inſtituted ſuch a *Monarchy* in his *Church*, and none of the *Apoſtles* mention any thing of it in any of the *Epiſtles* which they writ, in which are ſeveral things concerning the *Peace* and *Government* of the *Church*: nay, when there were *Schiſms* and *diviſions* in the *Church*, and that on the account of their Teachers, among whom *Cephas* was one (by that very name on which *Chriſt* ſaid *he would build his Church*) and yet no mention of reſpect more to *him*, than to any other: no intimation of what power St. *Peter* had for the Government of the *Church*, as the *Head* and *Monarch* of it: no references at all made to him by any of the divided parties of the *Church* at that time: no mention at all of any ſuch power given him in the *Epiſtles* written by him, but he writes juſt as any other *Apoſtle* did, with great expreſſions of humility; and, as if he foreſaw what *Uſurpations* would be in the Church, he forbids any *Lording it over Gods heritage*, and calls *Chriſt the chief Paſtor of the Church*. And this he doth in an Epiſtle not writ to the *Catholick Church*, which had been moſt proper for him if *Head of the Church*, but only to the *diſperſed Jews* in ſome particular Provinces. Can any one then imagine he ſhould be *Monarch* of the *Church*, and no act of his, as ſuch, recorded at all of him; but carrying himſelf with all humility, not fixing himſelf as *Head of the Church* in any *Chair*, but going up and down from one place to another, as the reſt of the *Apoſtles* for promoting the *Goſpel of Chriſt*? To conclude all; Is it poſſible to conceive there ſhould be a *Monarch* appointed by *Chriſt* in the *Church*, and yet the *Apoſtle* when he reckons up thoſe offices which *Chriſt* had ſet in the *Church*, ſpeak not one word of him? he mentions *Apoſtles*, *Prophets*,

Eph. 4. 11. *Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors and Teachers*; but the chief of all is omitted, and he to whom the care of all the reſt is committed; and in whoſe Authority the welfare, peace, and unity of the *Church* is ſecured. Theſe things to me ſeem ſo incredible, that till you have ſatisfied my mind in theſe *Queſtions*, I muſt needs judge this pretended *Monarchy* in the *Church* to be one of the greateſt *Figments* ever were in the Chriſtian world. And thus I have at large conſidered your Argument from *Reaſon*, Why there ſhould be ſuch a *Monarchy* in the *Church*; which I have the rather done, becauſe it is one of the great things in diſpute between us, and becauſe the moſt plauſible Argument brought for it, is, *The neceſſity of it in order to the Churches peace*, which *Monarchy* being the beſt of *Governments* would the moſt tend to promote. To return now to his Lordſhip.

§. 11. He brings an evidence out of Antiquity againſt the acknowledgement
P. 201. of any ſuch *Monarchy* in the Church *from the* literæ communicatoriæ *which certified from one great Patriarch to another, Who were fit or unfit to be admitted to their Communion, upon any occaſion of repairing from one See to another. And theſe were ſent mutually, and as freely in the ſame manner from* Rome *to the other Patriarchs, as from them to it. Out of which* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *I think this will follow moſt directly, that the Church-Government then was Ariſtocratical. For had the Biſhop of* Rome *been then accounted ſole Monarch of the Church, and been put into the definition of the Church* (*as he is now by* Bellarmin) *all theſe communicatory Letters ſhould have been directed from him to the reſt, as whoſe admittance ought to be a rule for all to communicate; but not from others to him, at leaſt not in that even equal brotherly way, as now they appear to be written. For it is no way probable the Biſhops of* Rome *which even then ſought their own greatneſs too much, would have ſubmitted to the other Patriarchs voluntarily, had not the very courſe of the Church put it*
P. 220. *upon them.* To this you Anſwer, *That theſe* literæ communicatoriæ *do rather prove our aſſertion, being ordained by* Sixtus 1. *in favour of ſuch Biſhops as were called to* Rome, *or otherwiſe forced to repair thither; to the end they might without Scruple, be received into their own Dioceſe at their return: having alſo decreed, that without ſuch letters communicatory, none in ſuch caſe ſhould be admitted. But that theſe letters ſhould be ſent from other Biſhops to* Rome *in ſuch an even, equal, and brotherly way, you ſay, is one of his Lordſhips Chimæra's. But this difference, or inequality you pretend to be in them; that thoſe to the Pope were meerly Teſtimonial; thoſe from him were Mandatory, witneſs* (ſay you) *the caſe of St.* Athanaſius *and other Biſhops reſtored by the Popes communicatory letters. But ſuppoſing them equal, you ſay, it only ſhewed the Popes humility; and ought to be no prejudice to his juſt authority, and his right and power to do otherwiſe if he ſaw cauſe.* But all this depends upon a meer fiction, *viz. That theſe communicatory letters were ordained by* Sixtus 1. *in favour of ſuch Biſhops as were called to* Rome, *than which nothing can be more improbable.* But I do not ſay, that this is a *Chimæra* of your
Baron Annal. A. D. 142. §. 6. Bin. Concil. To. 1. p. 74. own Brains, for you follow *Baronius* in it: for which he produceth no other evidence, but the Author of the *lives* of the *Popes*: but *Binius* adds that which ſeems to have been the firſt ground of it, which is the ſecond *decretal Epiſtle of* Sixtus 1. in which that Decree is extant: But whoſoever conſiders the notorious forgery of thoſe *decretal Epiſtles* (as will be more manifeſted where you contend for them) on which account they are
Baron An. 865. ſect. 5. 8. ſlighted by *Card. Perron*, and in many places by *Baronius* himſelf, will find little cauſe to triumph in this Epiſtle of *Sixtus* 1. And whoever reflects on the ſtate of thoſe times in which *Sixtus* lived, will find it improbable enough, that the *Pope* ſhould take to himſelf ſo much Authority to ſummon *Biſhops* to him, and to order that none ſhould be admitted without *Communicatory letters* from him. It is not here a place to enquire into the

ſeveral

ſeveral ſorts of thoſe *letters* which paſſed among the *Biſhops* of the Primitive *Church*, whether the *Canonical*, *Pacifical*, *Eccleſiaſtical*, and *Communicatory*, were all one; and what difference there was between the *Communicatory letters* granted to Travellers, in order to their Communion with foreign Churches, and thoſe *letters* which were ſent from one *Patriarch* to another. But this is ſufficiently evident, that thoſe *letters* which were the *teſſera hoſpitalitatis*, as *Tertullian* calls it, the Paſs-port for Communion in foreign Churches, had no more reſpect to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, than to any other *Catholick Biſhop*. Therefore the *Council* of *Antioch* paſſeth two *Canons* concerning them; one, *That no Traveller ſhould be received without them*; another, *That none but Biſhops ſhould give them*. And that all *Biſhops* did equally grant them to all places, appears by that paſſage in St. *Auſtin*, in his Epiſtle to *Euſebius* and the other *Donatiſts*, relating the conference he had with *Fortunius a Biſhop of that party*; wherein St. *Auſtin* asked him, *Whether he could give communicatory letters whither he pleaſed? for by that means it might be eaſily determined whether he had communion with the whole Catholick Church, or no.* From whence it follows, that any *Catholick Biſhop* might without any reſpect to the *Biſhop* of *Rome* grant *Communicatory letters* to all foreign *Churches*. And the enjoying of that *Communion* which was conſequent upon theſe *letters*, is all that *Optatus* means in that known ſaying of his, that they had Communion with *Siricius* at *Rome*, *commercio formatarum*, by the uſe of theſe *communicatory letters*. But beſides theſe, there were other letters, which every *Patriarch* ſent to the reſt upon his firſt inſtallment, which were call'd their *Synodical Epiſtles*, and theſe contained the profeſſion of their Faith; and the anſwers to them did denote their *Communion* with them. Since therefore theſe were ſent to all the *Patriarchs* indifferently, and not barely to the *Biſhop of Rome*; there appears no difference at all in the letters ſent to or from him and the other *Patriarchs* on this occaſion. As for your inſtance of the *Popes reſtoring* Athanaſius, I have ſufficiently anſwered it already; and if the *Popes* letter were never ſo *Mandatory* (as it was not) yet we ſee it took no effect among the *Eaſtern Biſhops*: and therefore they were of his Lordſhips mind, *That the Government of the Church was not Monarchical, but Ariſtocratical.* I did expect here to have met with the pretended Epiſtle of *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople* about the manner of making *formed letters*, wherein one ☩ is ſaid to be for the honour of St. *Peter*; but ſince you paſs it over, on this occaſion, I hope you are convinced of the Forgery of it.

Council. Antioc. can. 7, 8.

Aug. Epiſt. 163.

Optat. l. 2.

In the beginning of your next *Chapter* (which becauſe of the coherence of the matter I handle with this) you find great fault with his *Lordſhip for a Marginal citation out of* Gerſon, *becauſe he ſuppoſeth that* Gerſons *judgement was, that the Church might continue without a Monarchical head, becauſe he writ a Tract* de Auferibilitate Papæ; *whereas*, you ſay, *Gerſons drift is only to ſhew how many ſeveral ways the Pope may be taken away, that is, deprived of his office, and ceaſe to be Pope as to his own perſon, ſo that the Church*, pro tempore, *till another be choſen ſhall be without her viſible Head.* But although the truth of what his Lordſhip proves, doth not at all depend upon this Teſtimony of *Gerſon*, which was only a *Marginal citation*; yet ſince you ſo boldly accuſe him for a *falſe allegation*, we muſt further examine how pertinent this Teſtimony is to that which his Lordſhip brought it for. The ſentence to which this Citation of *Gerſon* refers, is this. *For they are no mean ones, who think our Saviour Chriſt left the Church-militant in the hands of the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors, in an Ariſtocratical, or rather a mixt Government; and that the Church is not Monarchical, otherwiſe than the Triumphant and Militant make one body under Chriſt the*

§. 12. P. 221.

P. 220.

Head. Over againſt theſe words, that Tract of *Gerſon de Auferibilitate Papæ* is cited. If therefore ſo much be contained in that Book as makes good this, which his Lordſhip ſays; he is not ſo much guilty of falſe alledging *Gerſon*, as you are of falſly accuſing him. To make this clear, we muſt conſider what *Gerſons* deſign was in writing that Book, and what his opinion therein is concerning the *Churches Government.* It is well known, that his Book was written upon the occaſion of the *Council* of *Conſtance* in the time of the great *Schiſm* between the three *Popes*; and that the deſign of it, is, to make it appear that it was in the power of the *Council* to depoſe the *Popes*, and ſuſpend them from all *Juriſdiction* in the *Church.* Therefore, he ſaith, *That the Pope may not only loſe his office by voluntary ceſſion; but that in many caſes he may be deprived by the Church, or by a General Council repreſenting the Church, whether he conſent to it or no:* Nay, in the next conſideration, he ſaith, *That he may be deprived by a General Council which is celebrated without his conſent or againſt his will*; And, in the following conſideration adds, *That this may be done not only declaratively, but juridically:* the Queſtion now comes to this, Whether a perſon who aſſerts theſe things, doth believe the *Government* of the *Militant Church* to be *Monarchical*, and not rather *Ariſtocratical* and *mixt Government?* And I dare appeal to any mans reaſon, whether that may be accounted a *Monarchical Government*, where he that is *Supreme* may be depoſed and deprived of his office in a *Juridical manner*, by a *Senate* that hath Authority to do theſe things? For it is apparent, the *Supreme power* lyes in the *Senate* and not the *Prince*, and that the *Prince* is only a *Miniſterial Head* under them. And this is plainly *Gerſons* opinion as to the *Church*; although therefore he may allow the ſupreme *Miniſterial Authority* to be in the *Pope*, (which is all your Citations prove) yet the *radical* and intrinſecal *power* lyes in the *Church*, which being repreſented in a *General Council*, may *depoſe* the *Pope* from his *Authority* in the *Church.* And the truth is, this opinion of *Gerſon* makes the Fundamental power of the Church to be *Democratical*, and that the *Supreme Exerciſe* is by *Repreſentatives* in a *General Council*, and that the *Pope* at the higheſt, is but a *Miniſterial* and *accountable Head.* And therefore *Spalatenſis* truly obſerves, *That this opinion of* Gerſon (which is the ſame with that of the *Paris Divines*, of which he ſpeaks) *doth only in words attribute ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction to the Pope, but in reality it takes it quite away from him.* And this is the ſame *Doctrine* which then prevailed in the *Council of Conſtance*, and afterwards at *Baſil*, as may be ſeen at large in their *Synodical Epiſtle*, defended by *Richerius*, *Vigorius*, and others. Now let any man of reaſon judge, whether, notwithſtanding your charge of *falſe citation*, (from ſome expreſſions intimating only a *Miniſterial Headſhip*) his Lordſhip did not very pertinently cite this Tract of *Gerſons*, to prove *that no mean perſons did think the Church Militant, not to be Governed by a Monarchical, but by an Ariſtocratical or mixt Government?*

Gerſon de Auferibilitate Papæ Conſider. 10.

Spalat. de Rep. Eccleſ. Tom. 1. *l.*4. *c.*7. *ſect.*5.

§. 13. P. 222. But no ſooner is this marginal citation cleared, but the charge is renewed about another, *viz.* St. *Hierom*; yet here you dare not charge his Lordſhip with a falſe allegation, but you are put to your ſhifts to get off this Teſtimony as well as you can. For, St. *Hierom* ſaying expreſly in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, *Ubicunque fuerit Epiſcopus, ſive Romæ, ſive Eugubii, ſive Conſtantinopoli, ſive Rhegii, &c. ejuſdem meriti eſt, ejuſdem eſt & ſacerdotii*; his Lordſhip might well infer, *That doubtleſs he thought not of the Roman Biſhops Monarchy. For what Biſhop,* ſaith he, *is of the ſame merit or the ſame degree in the Prieſthood with the Pope, as things are now carried at* Rome? To this you Anſwer, *That he ſpeaks not of the Pope, as he is Pope, or in reſpect of that eminent Authority, which belongs to him as* St. Peters *Succeſſor, but*

but only compares him with another private Biſhop, in reſpect of meer character or power of a Biſhop, as Biſhop only. But though this be all which any of your party ever ſince the *Reformation* have been able to Anſwer to this place; yet nothing looks more like a meer *ſhift* than this doth. For had St. *Hierom* only compared theſe *Biſhops* together in regard of their *order*, was not *Sacerdotium* enough to expreſs that by? if St. *Hierom* had ſaid only, that all Biſhops are *ejuſdem ſacerdotii*, there might have been ſome plauſible pretence for this diſtinction; but when he adds *ejuſdem meriti* too, he wholly precludes the poſſibility of your evading that way. For, What doth *merit* here ſtand for as diſtinct from Prieſthood, if it imports not ſomething beſides what belongs to *Biſhops as Biſhops?* What can *merit* here ſignifie, but ſome greater *Power*, *Authority*, and *Juriſdiction* given by *Chriſt* to one *Biſhop* above another? S. *Hierom* was not ſo ſenſleſs, as not to ſee that the *Biſhops of Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, *and Alexandria*, had greater *Authority*, and larger *Juriſdiction* in the *Church*, than the petty *Biſhops* of *Eugubium*, *Rhegium*, and *Tanis*; but all this he knew well enough came by the cuſtom of the *Church*, that one *Biſhop* ſhould have larger power in the *Church* than another. But (ſaith he) if you come to urge us with what ought to be practiſed in the *Church*, then, ſaith he, *Orbis major eſt Urbe*, it is no one City, as that of *Rome* (which he particularly inſtanceth in) which can preſcribe to the whole world; For (ſaith he) *all Biſhops are of equal merit, and the ſame Prieſthood, whereſoever they are, whether at* Rome *or elſewhere.* So that it is plain to all, but ſuch as wilfully blind themſelves, that St. *Hierom* ſpeaks not of that, which you call, *the Character of Biſhops*, but of the *Authority* of them; for that very word he uſeth immediately before, *Si authoritas quæritur, orbis major eſt urbe.* And where do you ever find *merit* applyed to the *Biſhops Character?* They who ſay, It is underſtood of the *merit of good life*, make St. *Hierom* ſpeak non-ſenſe. For are all *Biſhops* of the *ſame merit of good life?* But we need not go out of *Rome* for the proper importance of *merit* here. For in the *third Roman Synod under* Symmachus, that very word is uſed concerning Authority and Principality in the Church; *ejus ſedi primum Petri Apoſtoli meritum ſive principatus, deinde Conciliorum venerandorum authoritas*, &c. where *Binius* confeſſeth an account is given of the *Supremacy* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, the firſt ground of which is St. *Peters merit or principality*; apply now but this ſenſe to S. *Hierom*, and he may be very eaſily underſtood, All *Biſhops* are *ejuſdem meriti ſive principatus, of the ſame merit, Dignity or Authority in the Church.* But you ſay, *he ſpeaks not of the Pope, as he is Pope*: good reaſon for it, for St. *Hierom* knew no ſuch *Supremacy* in the *Pope*, as he now challengeth. And can you think, if St. *Hierom* had believed ſuch an authority in the *Pope* as you do, he would ever have uſed ſuch words as theſe are, to compare him with the poor *Biſhop* of *Agobio* in *Merit* and *Prieſthood?* I cannot perſwade my ſelf you can think ſo, only ſomething muſt be ſaid for the cauſe you have undertaken to defend. And ſince *Bellarmin*, and ſuch great men, had gone before you, you could not believe there were any abſurdity in ſaying as they did. Still you ſay, *He doth not ſpeak of that Authority which belongs to the Biſhop of* Rome, *as S.* Peter's *Succeſſor.* But if you would but read a little further, you might ſee that S. *Hierom* ſpeaks of all *Biſhops*, whether at *Rome*, or *Eugubium*, &c. as equally the *Apoſtles Succeſſors: For, it is neither* (ſaith he) *riches or poverty which makes Biſhops higher or lower. Cæterùm omnes Apoſtolorum ſucceſſores ſunt*; but they are all the Apoſtles Succeſſors; therefore he ſpeaks of them with relation to that *Authority* which they derived from the *Apoſtles*. And never had there been greater neceſſity for him to ſpeak of the *Popes ſucceeding S. Peter* in the *Supremacy* over the *Church* than here, if he had

Concil. Rom. 3. ſub Symmacho. To. 3. p. 688.

known any ſuch thing, but he muſt be excuſed, he was ignorant of it. *No, that he could not be* (ſay you again) *for he ſpeaks of it elſewhere, and therefore he muſt be ſo underſtood there, as that he neither contradict nor condemn himſelf.* But if the Epiſtle to *Damaſus* be all your evidence for it, a ſufficient account hath been given of that already: *therefore you add more*, and bid us go find them out, to ſee, Whether they make for the purpoſe or no. I am ſure your *firſt* doth not out of his *Commentary* on the 13 *Pſalm*, becauſe it only ſpeaks of S. *Peters being Head of the Church*, and not of the *Popes*, and that may import only *dignity* and *preheminence*, without authority and juriſdiction: beſides, that *Commentary* on the *Pſalms* is rejected as ſpurious by *Eraſmus*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, and many others among your ſelves. Your ſecond, *ad Demetriadem Virginem*, is much leſs to your purpoſe; for that only ſpeaks of *Innocentius* coming after *Anaſtaſius* at *Rome*, *qui Apoſtolicæ Cathedræ & ſupradicti viri ſucceſſor & filius eſt, Who ſucceeded him in the Apoſtolical Chair*; But, Do you not know that there were many *Apoſtolical Chairs* beſides that of *Rome*, and had every one of them ſupreme authority over the Church of God? What that ſhould be on the 16 of S. *Matthew*, I cannot imagine, unleſs it be that S. *Peter* is called *Princeps Apoſtolorum*, which honour we deny him not, or that he ſaith, *Ædificabo Eccleſiam meam ſuper te*: But how theſe things concern the *Popes Authority*, unleſs you had further enlightned us, I cannot underſtand. That *ep.* 54. *ad Marcellam*, is of the ſame nature with the laſt, for the words which I ſuppoſe you mean, are, *Petrus ſuper quem Dominus fundavit Eccleſiam*; and if you ſee, what *Eraſmus* ſaith upon that place, you will have little cauſe to boaſt much of it. Your laſt place is, *l.* 1. *Cont. Lucifer.* which I ſuppoſe to be that commonly cited thence; *Eccleſiæ ſalus in ſummi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet*; but there even *Marianus Victorius* will tell you, it is underſtood of every *ordinary Biſhop*. Thus I have taken the pains to ſearch thoſe places you nakedly refer us to in S. *Hierom*, and find him far enough from the leaſt danger of contradicting or condemning himſelf, as to any thing which is here ſpoken by him. So that we ſee S. *Hierom* remains a ſufficient teſtimony againſt the *Popes Monarchical Government* of the *Church*.

§. 14. P. 201. *Optat. l.* 3. His Lordſhip further argues againſt this *Monarchy* in the *Church from the great and undoubted Rule given by* Optatus; *that whereſoever there is a Church, there the Church is in the Common-wealth, and not the Common-wealth in the Church. And ſo alſo the Church was in the Roman Empire. Now from this ground* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *I argue thus. If the Church be within the Empire, or other Kingdom, 'tis impoſſible the Government of the Church ſhould be Monarchical. For no Emperour or King will endure another King within his Dominion, that ſhall be greater than himſelf, ſince the very enduring* P. 223. *it makes him that endures it upon the matter no Monarch.* Your anſwer to this, is, *That theſe two Kingdoms are of different natures, the one ſpiritual, the other temporal: the one exerciſed only in ſuch things as concern the worſhip of God, and the Eternal Salvation of ſouls; the other in affairs that concern this world only.* Surely you would perſwade us, we had never heard of, much leſs read *Bellarmin's fifth Book de Pontifice*, about the *Popes Temporal Power*, which was fain to get licence for the other *four* to paſs at *Rome*; and although he minces the matter as much as may be, and much more than *Baronius* and others did, who pleaded downright for the *Popes Temporal Power*; yet he muſt be a very weak *Prince*, who doth not ſee how far that *indirect* and *reductive power*, may extend, when the *Pope* himſelf is to be *Judge*, What comes under it, and what not. And, What may not come under it, when *depoſing of Princes* ſhall be reduced under that you call *The Worſhip of God?* and *abſolving Subjects from their obedience*, tend to promote

mote their *Eternal Salvation?* But if the *Pope* may be *Judge*, What *temporal things* are *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, and bring them under his power in that reſpect, Why may not the *Prince* be *Judge* what *ſpiritual things* are *in ordine ad temporalia*, and uſe his *power* over them in that reſpect too? But in the mean time, Is not a *Kingdom* like to be at peace then? If the *Pope* challenged no other authority but *what Chriſt or the Apoſtles had*, his Government might be admitted, as well as that authority which they had; but, What do you think of us the mean while, when you would perſwade us, that the *Popes Power* is no other than what *Chriſt* or the *Apoſtles* had? you muſt certainly think us ſuch perſons *as the Moon hath wrought particularly upon*, as you after very civilly ſpeak concerning his Lordſhip. Your inſtance *from the Kings of* France *and* Spain, his Lordſhip had ſufficiently anſwered, by telling you, *That he that is not blind may ſee if he will, of what little value the Popes Power is in thoſe Kingdoms, further than to ſerve their own turns of him, which they do to their great advantage.* And when you would have this to be *upon the account of Faith and Conſcience*, Let the *Pope* exerciſe his power apparently againſt their *Intereſt*, and then ſee, on what account they profeſs obedience to him. But, as long as they can manage ſuch pretences for their advantage, and admit ſo much of it, and no more, they may very well endure it, and his Lordſhip be far enough from contradicting himſelf. When you would urge the ſame inconvenience againſt the *Ariſtocratical Government* of the *Church*, you ſuppoſe that *Ariſtocratical Government* wholly *Independent* on, and not ſubordinate to, the *Civil Government*; whereas his Lordſhip and the *Church of England* aſſert the *Kings Supremacy in Government over all, both perſons and cauſes Eccleſiaſtical:* And therefore this nothing concerns us. And if from what hath gone before, *it muſt*, as you ſay, *remain therefore fully proved, that the external Government of the Church on earth is Monarchical*; It may for all that I ſee, remain as fully proved, that you are now the man who enjoy this *Monarchical Power* over the *Church*. And whatever you ſtile the *Pope*, Whether *the Deputy*, or *Vicar General of Chriſt*, or *Servus ſervorum*, or what you will; it is all one to us as long as we know his meaning, whatever fair words you give him. As though men would take it one jot the better to have one uſurp and *Tyrannize* over them, becauſe he doth not call himſelf *King* or *Prince*, but *their humble ſervant*. Is it not by ſo much the greater *Tyranny?* to have ſuch kind of *Eccleſiaſtical Saturnalia*, when the *ſervus ſervorum* muſt, under that name, *tyrannize* over the whole world? P. 224.

We have already at large ſhewed, How deſtructive this pretended Supremacy is to that Government of the Church by *Biſhops*, which, his Lordſhip proves *from the ancient Canons and Fathers of the Church, doth of right belong to them*, viz. *from ſeveral Canons of the Councils of* Antioch *and* Nice, *and the teſtimonies of S.* Auguſtine *and S.* Cyprian. To all this you only ſay, *That you allow the Biſhops their portion in the Government of Chriſts Flock:* But it is but a very ſmall portion of what belongs to them, if all their *Juriſdiction* muſt be derived from the *Pope*; which I have ſhewed before to be the moſt current Opinion in your Church: And I dare ſay, you will not diſpute the contrary. His Lordſhip was well enough aware, to what purpoſe *Bellarmine* acknowledged that the *Government of the Church* was ever in the *Biſhops*; for he himſelf ſaith, *It was to exclude temporal Princes; but then he deſires* A. C. *to take notice of that, when Secular Princes are to be excluded, then it ſhall be pretended, that Biſhops have power to govern: but when it comes to ſharing ſtakes between them and the Pope, then hands off*; they have nothing to do any further than the *Pope* gives them leave. What follows concerning the impoſſibility of a right executing of this *Monarchy* in the *Church* hath been already diſcourſed of, and you anſwer nothing P. 202. P. 224.

thing at all to it that hath any face of pertinency; for when you ſay, it will hold as well againſt the *Ariſtocratical Form*, I have plainly enough ſhewed you the contrary.

§. 15. That which follows about the deſign of an *Univerſal Monarchy* in the *State*, as well as the *Church*; about *Pope* Innocent's *making the Pope to be the Sun, and the Emperour the Moon, the Spaniſh Friers two Scutchions*, Campanella's *Eclogue*, ſince you will not ſtand to defend them, I ſhall willingly paſs them over. But what concerns the *Supremacy* of the Civil Power, is more to our purpoſe, and muſt be conſidered. His Lordſhip therefore

P. 225, 227.

P. 205. ſaith, *That every ſoul was to be ſubject to the higher power*, Rom. 13. 1. *And the higher Power there mentioned, is the Temporal. And the ancient Fathers come in with a full conſent, that every ſoul comprehends all without exception: All ſpiritual men, even to the higheſt Biſhop, even in ſpiritual cauſes too, ſo the Foundations of Faith and good Manners be not ſhaken: And where they are ſhaken, there ought to be prayer and patience, there ought not to be oppoſition by force. Nay, Emperours and Kings are* cuſtodes utriuſque Tabulæ; *They to whom the cuſtody and preſervation of both Tables of the Law, for worſhip to God, and duty to man, are committed. A Book of the Law was by Gods own command in* Moſes *his time, to be given to the King*, Deut. 17. 18. *And the Kings under the Law, but ſtill according to it, did proceed to neceſſary Reformation in Church-buſineſſes; and therein commanded the very Prieſts themſelves, as appears in the Acts of* Hezekiah *and* Joſiah, *who yet were never cenſured to this day for uſurping the High-Prieſts office. Nay, and the greateſt Emperours for the Churches honour,* Theodoſius *the elder, and* Juſtinian, *and* Charles *the Great, and divers others, did not only meddle now and then, but enact Laws to the great ſettlement and encreaſe of Religion in their ſeveral times.* Now to this again, you anſwer, *That the civil and ſpiritual are both abſolute and independent powers, though each in their proper Orb, the one in ſpirituals, the other in temporals.* But, What is this to that which his Lordſhip proves, *That there can be no ſuch abſolute independent ſpiritual power; both becauſe all are bound to obey the Civil Power, and becauſe the Civil Power hath a right to meddle in Eccleſiaſtical matters?* And, though you expreſs never ſo much honour to civil authority, yet ſtill you limit it *to the adminiſtration meerly of civil affairs*; and how far that is, is well enough known. You tell us plainly, *That it doth not belong to the Emperor to order the affairs of the Church*; But why do you not anſwer the Reaſons and Inſtances which his Lordſhip brings to the contrary? Yet you yield, *That in caſe of notorious and groſs abuſes, manifeſtly contrary to Religion, and connived at by the Paſtors of the Church, Chriſtian Princes may lawfully and piouſly uſe their Authority, in procuring the ſaid abuſes to be effectually redreſſed by the ſaid Paſtors, as the examples of* Ezekias *and* Joſias *prove.* But in caſe the *High-Prieſt* would not have yielded to ſuch a reformation, Might not thoſe *Princes*, by the aſſiſtance of other *Prieſts*, have effected it? This is the caſe you were to ſpeak to: For whereas you fly out, and ſay, *That Princes may not take the Prieſts office upon them*; Whom do you diſpute againſt in that? Not his Lordſhip certainly, nor any of the *Church* of *England*, who never ſaid they might, though they have been moſt injuriouſly calumniated, as though they did. That which we aſſert, is, That *Princes* may enact *Laws* concerning Religion, and reform abuſes in *Divine Worſhip*, but we do not ſay, they may take the *Paſtoral office* upon them; and therefore you ſay no more in that than we do our ſelves. But when you ſay, *They may not reform Religion in the ſubſtance of it*, I cannot well tell how to underſtand you. If you mean, not ſo reform Religion, as to take away any of the *ſubſtance*, that is a Reformation to purpoſe; but if you bring it *ad hypotheſin*, we utterly deny that any of the ſubſtance of Religion

P. 226.

gion was taken away upon our *Churches* Reformation: If you mean, not reform abuſes which go under the name of the *ſubſtance* of *Religion*, that will be to make the moſt unſufferable abuſes the moſt incurable. But, when you add, *That nothing muſt be enacted pertaining to Religion by their own Authority without, or contrary to the Prieſts conſent* (the *High-Prieſt*, I ſuppoſe you mean) ſhew us, Where the *Kings* of *Iſrael* were bound, not to reform in caſe the *High-Prieſt* did not conſent: and if you could do this, you muſt prove ſuch a *High-Prieſt* now, and that *Princes* are bound to wait his leiſure for reforming abuſes in *Religion*, when his pretended *Authority* is upheld by maintaining them. As for your commendations of *Pope Hildebrand*, and *Innocent the Third, for very prudent men, and worthy Champions of your Church*, we ſee, What *prudence* is with you, and what a worthy *Church* you have. But it is ſtill an excellent evaſion, *That they never endeavoured to ſubject the Emperour to themſelves in temporal matters*; P. 227. no nor *Alexander* the Third neither, when he trod upon the *Emperors* neck? But the proceedings of theſe *Popes* with the *Emperors*, as likewiſe *Adrian* 4. *Lucius* 3. and others, are ſo groſs, that it had been more for your Intereſt with Chriſtian *Princes*, to diſown them, than to go about to palliate them with ſuch frivolous diſtinctions, that his *Underſtanding* muſt be as *blind* as his *Obedience*, that doth not ſee thorough them. You are much concerned, that his Lordſhip ſhould ſeem to give a laſh to thoſe mortified ſelf-denying men, *the Jeſuits, in bidding them leave their practiſing to advance the greatneſs of the Pope and Emperor; for, Who could believe they ſhould deprive themſelves of the riches and pleaſures of the world upon ſuch deſigns?* Undoubtedly you are one of the number, for I never heard that any other *Order* among you, did ever give them half ſo good words, but condemned them as much for their practiſing, as we do our ſelves. And, What *holy men* they are, and what excellent Caſuiſtical Divinity about both the riches and pleaſures of the world, if we did not otherwiſe know, the *Myſteries* of *Jeſuitiſm* would ſufficiently diſcover. To what his Lordſhip ſaith further, *That there is no neceſſity of one Supreme Living Judge, to keep the Church in peace and unity, but that the ſeveral Biſhops under their Soveraign Princes, are ſufficient in order to it*; P. 228. you only ſay, *That he quotes* Occham *for it*. But, Doth he nothing elſe but quote *Occham?* Why do you not anſwer to the thing, and not barely to *Occham?* You have very good reaſon for it; for you have little to ſay to the thing it ſelf; but for *Occham*, you have enough to tell him in his ear. 1. *That he is in the Index of forbidden Books*; a good teſtimony for the man's honeſty. 2. *That he ſided with the Emperor*; a crime beyond an *Index Expurgatorius* at *Rome*. 3. *That if there were ſuch a Government as* Occham *ſuppoſes, all thoſe Governours muſt be Infallible, or elſe there would be meer Anarchy in the Church*: And, Why not as well in the *State*, without *Infallibility* there? You ſay, *For want of this Infallibility, thoſe Countries where it is not acknowledged, are in Schiſms*: And we ſay, The pretence of this *Infallibility* hath cauſed the greateſt of them. 4. You ſay, *Occham ſpeaks only* de poſſibili, *of what might have been, if our Saviour had pleaſed*; but *Occham* ſays, There is no neceſſity there ſhould be one chief Governour under Chriſt, and we ſay, You can never prove that Chriſt hath appointed that there ſhall be one; and therefore this is more than diſputing a bare poſſibility.

But now, as though all your beggings the Queſtion had been arguments, all your ſayings proofs, and all your proofs demonſtrations, with as much authority as if you were *in Cathedrâ*, you conclude; *Remain it therefore a ſettled Catholick Principle, that the Pope hath power over the whole Church of God*; But you leave out ſomething which ſhould be at the end of

of it, *among all thoſe who can believe things as ſtrongly without reaſon, as with it.* And for the greater ſolemnity of the Sentence you give it in the words of the *Oecumenical Council* at *Florence:* And I muſt needs ſay, You have fitted them very well, for that was juſt as much an *Oecumenical Council*, as the *Pope* is *Oecumenical Paſtor:* but, that neither the one nor the other is ſo, I have ſufficiently proved already.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Council of *Trent.*

The Illegality of it manifeſted, firſt from the inſufficiency of the Rule it proceeded by, different from that of the firſt General Councils, and from the Popes Preſidency in it. The matter of Right concerning it, diſcuſſed. In what Caſes Superiours may be excepted againſt as Parties. The Pope juſtly excepted againſt as a Party, and therefore ought not to be Judge. The Neceſſity of a Reformation in the Court of Rome, *acknowledged by Roman Catholicks. The matter of fact enquired into, as to the Popes Preſidency in General Councils.* Hoſius *did not preſide in the Nicene Council as the Popes Legat. The Pope had nothing to do in the ſecond General Council. Two Councils held at* Conſtantinople, *within two years; theſe ſtrangely confounded. The miſtake made evident.* S. Cyril *not Preſident in the third General Council as the Popes Legat. No ſufficient evidence of the Popes Preſidency in following Councils. The juſtneſs of the Exception againſt the place, manifeſted; and againſt the freedom of the Council from the Oath taken by the Biſhops to the Pope. The form of that Oath in the time of the Council of* Trent. *Proteſtants not condemned by General Councils. The Greeks and others unjuſtly excluded as Schiſmaticks. The exception from the ſmall number of Biſhops cleared and vindicated. A General Council in Antiquity not ſo called from the Popes General Summons. In what ſenſe a General Council repreſents the whole Church. The vaſt difference between the proceedings in the Council of* Nice, *and that at* Trent. *The exception from the number of Italian Biſhops, juſtified. How far the Greek Church and the Patriarch* Hieremias *may be ſaid to condemn Proteſtants; with an account of the proceedings between them.*

§. 1. HAving thus far conſidered the ſeveral grounds on which you lay the charge of *Schiſm* upon us, and ſhewed at large the weakneſs and inſufficiency of them, we ſhould now have proceeded to the laſt part of our task, but that the great *Palladium* of the preſent *Roman Church*, viz. the *Council* of *Trent*, muſt be examined, to ſee whether it be Διοπετὲς, or no; whether it came from *Heaven*, or was only the contrivance of ſome cunning Artificers. And the famous *Biſhop* of *Bitonto* in the Sermon made at the opening the *Council* of *Trent*, hath given us ſome ground to conjecture its original by his comparing it ſo ominouſly to the *Trojan-horſe*. Although therefore that the pretences may be high and great, that it was made *Divina Palladis arte*, the *Spirit of God* being ſaid to be preſent in it, and concurring with it, yet they who ſearch further will find as much of *Artifice* in contriving, and deceit in the managing the one as the other. And although the *Cardinal Palavicino* uſes all his art, to bring this Similitude off, without reflecting on the honour of the *Council*; yet that *Biſhop*, who in that *Sermon* pleaded ſo much, *That the Spirit of God would open the mouths of the Council, as he did once thoſe of* Balaam *and* Caiaphas, was himſelf in this expreſſion an illuſtrious Inſtance of the truth of what he ſaid.

Hiſt. Council of *Trent. l.* 1. *p.* 132.

For

For he ſpake as true in this, as if he had been *High-Prieſt himſelf that year.* But, as if you really believed your ſelf the truth of that *Biſhops* Doctrine, *That whatever ſpirit was within them, yet being met in Council, the Spirit of God would infallibly inſpire them*, you ſet your ſelf to a ſerious vindication of the proceedings of that *Council*; and not only ſo, but triumph in it, as that which will bring *the cauſe to a ſpeedy Iſſue.* And therefore we muſt particularly enquire into all the pretences you bring to juſtifie the lawfulneſs and freedom of that *Council*; but, to keep to the *Biſhops Metaphor*,

> *Accipe nunc Danaûm Inſidias; & crimine ab uno*
> *Diſce omnes.*

And when we have thorowly ſearched this great *Engine* of your *Church*, we ſhall have little reaſon to believe, *that ever it fell from Heaven.* His Lordſhip then having ſpoken *of the uſefulneſs of free General Councils, for making ſome Laws which concern the whole Church*; His Adverſary thinks preſently to give him a *Choak-pear*, by telling him, *That the Council of* Trent *was a General Council; and that had already judged the Proteſtants to hold errors.* This you call, *Laying the Axe to the Root of the Tree*; that *Tree*, you mean, out of which the *Popes* Infallible *Chair* was cut: for the management of this diſpute about the *Council* of *Trent*, will redound very little to the honour of your *Church* or Cauſe. But you do well to add, *That his Lordſhip was not taken unprovided:* for he truly anſwered, *That the Council of* Trent *was neither a Legal, nor a General Council.* Both theſe we undertake to make good, in oppoſition to what you bring by way of anſwer to his Lordſhips Exceptions to them.

P. 229. P. 213.

That which we begin with, is, That it was not a *Legal Council*, which his Lordſhip proves: Firſt, *Becauſe that Council maintained publickly, that it is lawful for them to conclude any Controverſie, and make it to be* de Fide, *and ſo in your judgement fundamental, though it have not a written word for its warrant; nay, ſo much as a probable teſtimony from Scripture.* The force of his Lordſhips argument I ſuppoſe lies in this, that the Decrees of that *Council* cannot be ſuch as ſhould bind us to an aſſent to them; becauſe according to their own principles, thoſe Decrees may have no foundation in *Scripture*: And that the only legal proceeding in *General Councils*, is, to decree according to the *Scriptures.* Now to this you anſwer, *That the meaning of the Council, or Catholick Authors, is not, that the Council may make whatever they pleaſe matter of Faith, but only that which is expreſſed or involved in the Word of God written or unwritten*; and this you confeſs, *is defined by the Council of* Trent, *in theſe terms, that in matters of Faith we are to rely not only upon Scripture, but alſo on Tradition: which Doctrine* (you ſay) *is true, and that you have already proved it:* And I may as well ſay, It is falſe, for I have already anſwered all your pretended proofs. But it is one thing, Whether the Doctrine be *true* or no; and another, Whether the *Council* did proceed *legally* in defining things upon this principle. For upon your grounds you are bound to believe it true, becauſe the *Council* hath defined it to be ſo: But if you will undertake to juſtifie the proceedings of the *Council* as *legal*, you muſt make it appear that this was the Rule which *General Councils* have always acted by, in defining any thing to be matter of Faith. But if this appear to be falſe; and that you cannot inſtance in any true *General Council*, which did look on this as a ſufficient ground to proceed upon, then though the thing may, ſince that Decree, be believed as *true*, yet that *Council* did not proceed *legally* in defining upon ſuch grounds. Name us therefore, What *Council* did ever offer to determine a *matter* of *Faith* meerly upon *Tradition?* In the four firſt *General Councils* it is well known, what authority was given to the *Scripture*

P. 230. §. 2.

in their definitions; and I hope you will not ſay, That any thing they defined, had no other ground but *Tradition*. But ſuppoſe you could prove this, it is not enough for your purpoſe, unleſs you can make it appear, that thoſe *Fathers* in making ſuch Decrees, did acknowledge they had no ground in *Scripture* for them. For if you ſhould prove that *really* there was no foundation but *Tradition*, yet all that you can infer thence, is, That thoſe *Fathers* were deceived in judging they had other grounds, when they had not. But ſtill, if they made *Scripture* their *Rule*, and looked on nothing elſe as a *Foundation* for their definitions but the *written word* of *God*, then the *Council* of *Trent* did not proceed *legally*, in offering to define matters of *Faith*, on ſuch grounds which were not acknowledged by the *Primitive Church*, to be ſufficient Foundation for ſuch Definitions. *Cardinal Cuſanus* at large gives an account of the method of proceeding in the *Ancient General Councils*, and therein tells us, not only *that the Word of God was placed in the middle among thoſe who ſate in Council*, but gives this as the only Rule of their proceeding, *quòd ſecundum teſtimonia Scripturarum decrevit Synodus*; that they decreed according to the teſtimonies of Scripture. Now if another *Council* ſhall go according to a different *Rule* from what the *Church* hath eſteemed the only *true* and *adæquate Foundation* for definition of *Faith*, that *Council* breaks the inviolable *Laws* of *Councils*, and therefore its proceedings cannot be *legal*. As for Inſtance; Suppoſing a *Parliament* not to have power to make new *Laws*, but to declare only what is *Law*, and what not (for that is all you pretend to, as to *General Councils*) and that all other former *Parliaments* have all along profeſſed this to be their Rule, *viz. that they ſearch into the body of the Laws*; and if any thing be controverted, Whether it be a *Law* or no, they make a diligent ſearch into it, and examine all circumſtances concerning it, for their own ſatisfaction, and according to the evidence they find of its being contained in this body of *Laws*, they declare themſelves: but many things growing much in *uſe* among a *prevailing party*, which have no colour of being in the *written Laws*, but yet tend much to the *Intereſt* of that *party*; and theſe being oppoſed by ſuch, who ſtand up for the ancient and known *Laws*, the other are forced to make uſe of as good an Expedient as they can, to preſerve their intereſt and credit together. To which end they pack together a company of ſuch, who are moſt concerned to maintain the things in *Queſtion*, and among theſe, the great *Innovator* ſits as *Preſident* among them, and ſuffers none to come there, but ſuch as are obliged by *Oath* to ſpeak nothing againſt his *Intereſt*; and theſe, when met together, ſeeing how unable they are to manage their buſineſs according to former *Precedents*; the firſt thing they do, is to declare, *That cuſtoms and uſages have as much the force of Laws among them, as any contained in the body of them*; and having eſtabliſhed this their *Rule*, according to it they decree all the matters in difference, to be true and real *Laws*. Would any man ſay, That theſe men proceeded *legally*, who firſt make the *Foundation* they are to go on, contrary to all former *Precedents*, and then define according to that? Yet this, in all particulars, is exactly the caſe of the *Council* of *Trent*; but the laſt part is that we are now about; that they ſhould, contrary to the proceedings of all *General Councils* in matters of *Faith*, firſt make their *Rule*, and then bind all men to all thoſe *Decrees* which are made according to it. And therefore, though the *Council* of *Trent* may be thought to act *wiſely* in advancing *Traditions* to an equality with *Scripture* in the firſt place, yet he muſt have a great deal of confidence, and little judgement, who ſayes, that in proceeding matters of Faith from Tradition, it acted *legally*; *i. e.* according to the rules of the undoubted *General Councils*. I cannot therefore ſay, whether you have more

Cuſanus de Concord. Cath. l. 2. c. 6.

more of the one, or leſs of the other, when you tell us without offering to prove it, *That the Council did not proceed in a different manner, from other lawful General Councils whilſt ſhe grounded her definitions, partly on Scripture, partly on Tradition, even in matters not deducible by any particular or Logical Inference from Scripture.* The abſurdity of which Doctrine in it ſelf, I have at large diſcovered already in our diſcourſe of the *Reſolution of Faith*, where it is ſhewed in what ſenſe his Lordſhip ſays, *That Apoſtolical Tradition is the Word of God*; But that this was a *legal way* of proceeding in the *Council* of *Trent*, to define matters of Faith by ſuch *Traditions* as have no ground in *Scripture*, had need be better proved, than by your bare Affirmation. And if that be a *Tradition* too, I am ſure it is one that is neither contained in, nor deducible from, the *Scripture*.

§. 3. 2. His Lordſhip juſtly excepts againſt the *Council* of *Trent*, *from the Popes ſitting as Preſident in it. For*, ſaith he, *Is that Council legal, where the Pope the chief perſon to be reformed ſhall ſit Preſident in it, and be chief Judge in his own cauſe againſt all Law, Divine, Natural, and Humane?* To this you return an Anſwer, both to the *matter* of *Right*, and the *matter of Fact*. To the *matter of Right*, you ſay, *That the Pope not being juſtly accuſable of any crime, but ſuch as muſt involve, not only the Council, but the whole Church as well as himſelf, the Proteſtants had no juſt cauſe to quarrel with the Popes preſiding in it. Nay, that it is conformable to all Law, Divine, Natural, and Humane, that the Head ſhould preſide over the members: and to give Novelliſts liberty to decline the Popes judgement, or the judgement of any other their lawful Superiors upon pretence of their being parties, is in effect to exempt abſolutely ſuch people from all legal cenſure; and to grant there is no ſufficient means effectually to govern the Church, or condemn Hereſie, Schiſm, and other offences againſt Religion.* But is it not unanſwerable on the other ſide, that this *plea* of yours makes it impoſſible, that the *errors* and *corruptions* of a *Church* ſhould be reformed, in caſe the *Governors* of the *Church* do abett and maintain them? If you ſay, *That it is not poſſible the Governors of the Church ſhould do ſo*, we have nothing but your bare word for it, and reaſon and experience manifeſt the contrary. In caſe then there be a vehement preſumption at leaſt, in a conſiderable party of the *Church*, that the *Church* is much degenerated and needs reformation, but thoſe who call themſelves the lawful *Superiors* of the *Church* utterly oppoſe it; What is to be done in this caſe? muſt the *Church* continue as it did, meerly becauſe the *Superiors* make themſelves *parties*? Nay, ſuppoſe that which you would call *Idolatry* be in the *Church*, and the *Pope* and a *Council* of his *packing* declare for it; muſt there be no endeavours of a *Reformation*, but by them who pronounce all *Hereticks* who oppoſe them? But you ſay, *The Head muſt preſide over the members*: an excellent Argument to defend all uſurpations both in *Church* and *State*! for doubtleſs, they who are in power will call themſelves the *Heads* of all others, if that will ſecure them from any danger. *But this will exempt them from all legal cenſure*: ſo will your principles, all *Governors* of the *Church* though guilty of *Hereſie*, *Blaſphemy*, *Idolatry*, or what crime ſoever. For ſtill, I hope, *the Head muſt be over the members*; and you ſay, *it will bring the Church to confuſion, if any ſhall except againſt their Superiors as parties.* You muſt therefore abſolutely and roundly aſſert, that it is impoſſible that the *Superiors* in the *Church* may be guilty of any error or corruption; or that, if they be, they muſt never be called to an account for it; or elſe that it may be juſt in ſome *caſes* to except againſt them as *parties*. And if in *ſome caſes*, then the queſtion comes to this, whether the preſent be *ſome* of thoſe caſes or no? and here if you make thoſe *Superiors Judges* again, what you granted before comes to nothing. This will be more clear by a parallel caſe:

P. 230, 231.

Suppoſe the ſetting up the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel* had been done without ſuch an open ſeparation as that of *Jeroboam* was, but that the people had ſenſibly declined from the worſhip of *God* at *Hieruſalem*, and had agreed to aſſemble at thoſe places, the *High-Prieſt*, and the *Prieſts* and *Levites* having deſerted *Hieruſalem*, and approving this alteration of *Gods worſhip*: But although this might continue for many years; yet ſome of the *Inferiour Prieſts* and others of the people reading the *Book* of the *Law*, they find the worſhip of *God* much altered from what it ought to be, which they publiſh and declare to others, and bring many of the people to be of their *mind*; but the *High-Prieſt* and his *Clergy* (foreſeeing how much it will be to their prejudice to bring things into their due order) they reſolutely oppoſe it. I pray tell me now, what were to be done in this caſe? Muſt the people ſtand wholly to the judgement of thoſe *Superiour Prieſts*, who have declared themſelves to be utterly averſe from any *Reformation*? And if a *Council* be called, is it reaſonable or juſt, that he ſhould ſit as *Preſident* in it, becauſe he pretends to be the *Head over the members? and that if Superiours be once accuſed as parties, all order and peace is gone?* Is there any way left or no, whereby the *Church* of *Iſrael* might be reformed? *Yes*, ſay you, *by a General Council*; but, Muſt it be ſuch a *General Council*, where the *High-Prieſt* ſits as *Preſident*, and all who ſit with him ſworn to do nothing againſt him? Is this a *Free and General Council* likely to reform theſe things? And is it not all the *Juſtice* in the world, that ſuch a *Council* ſhould be truly *Free and General*, and thoſe freely heard who complain of theſe as great corruptions? and that before the moſt equal and indifferent *Judges*; or, in caſe ſuch cannot be aſſembled, that by the *Aſſiſtance* of the *civil power*, the *Church* may be reformed by its *parts*: ſo that ſtill theſe *parts* be willing to give an account of what they do before any *Free and General Council*, where the main party accuſed ſits not as *Preſident* in it? *But what, then*, may you ſay? *will you allow all Inferiours to proceed to a Reformation, in caſe the Superiours do not preſently conſent?* No: but men ought firſt to exhibit their complaints of abuſes, and the *reaſons* againſt them, to thoſe who are actually the *Superiors* of the *Church*; and that with all due reverence to Authority; but if, notwithſtanding this, they declare themſelves wilful and obſtinate in defence of thoſe things, by the concurrence of the *Supream power* they may lawfully and juſtly proceed to a *Reformation*.

§. 4. P. 231. *Well*, (but you ſay,) *all this comes not to your caſe, for the Pope was not juſtly accuſable of any crime; for you deny not, but that other Biſhops in Council may proceed againſt the Pope himſelf, if the caſe do neceſſarily require it, as if he be a Heretick.* If you will then grant, that in ſome caſes, as in that of *Hereſie*, the *Pope* may be excepted againſt as a *Party*, you deſtroy all that ever you ſay beſides. For when the *Pope* is accuſed for *Hereſie* in a *Council*, Who muſt ſit as *Preſident* in that *Council?* the *Pope* himſelf, or not? If the *Pope* muſt ſit as Preſident, (for the *Head*, you ſay ſtill, *muſt be over the members*) Do you think he will ever be condemned for *Hereſie*, if he hath the ſupream management of the *Council?* If he may not ſit as *Preſident* then, by the ſame reaſon he ought not to do it, when he is accuſed of *error* or *Uſurpation*; but the other *Biſhops* of the *Church*, met together by the *Aſſiſtance* of *Chriſtian Princes* in a *Free* and *General Council*, ought to be *Judges* in that caſe, as well as the former. And this is no more than is agreeable to the Doctrine and practice of the *Councils* of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*; for if they had ſuffered the *Popes* to have been *Preſidents* in them, or have had that *power* over them, which the *Popes* had in the *Council* of *Trent*, Do you think they could have done ſo to the preſent *Popes* as they did? But the *Popes* were grown wiſer afterwards; they had theſe exam-

ples

ples freſh in their memory, and therefore they were reſolved never to be ridden by *General Councils* more. And thence came that continual oppoſition to all propoſals of the *Emperor* for a *General Council*, till neceſſity put the *Pope* upon yielding to it: thence came the reſolution at *Rome*, not to venture any more *Councils* in *Germany*, for that place breathed too much freedom for the *Popes* intereſt, though this were moſt vehemently deſired by, both the *Emperor*, and *German Princes* and *Biſhops*: Thence, when a *Council* muſt be called, he ſummons it firſt at *Mantua*, then at *Vicenza*, and when none would come thither, at laſt he yields it ſhould be at *Trent*, a moſt inconvenient place for the *Germans* to come to: when they were there, though all Art poſſible was uſed to prevent the mention of any thing of *Reformation*, yet ſometimes ſome free words breaking out, troubled the *Legats*, who diſpatch notice of it to *Rome*, and receive inſtructions what to do; yet all could not prevent their fears and jealouſies, leſt ſomething concerning the *Popes Intereſt* ſhould be diſcuſſed; upon which to make all ſure they tranſlate the *Council* to *Bononia*, and leave the Emperor's Biſhops to blow their fingers at *Trent*. And when upon the Emperor and King of *France*'s Proteſtations, the *Pope* ſaw a neceſſity of removing it back to *Trent* again, though any fair pretence would have been taken to have diſſolved the *Council*; yet ſince that could not be, the greateſt care muſt be uſed to ſpin out the time, in hopes of ſome occurrence happening, which might give a plauſible pretext for breaking it up. But to be ſure nothing muſt paſs, but what was privately diſpatched to *Rome* and approved there firſt, (a good ſure way to prevent any miſchief) and thence the *Holy-Ghoſt came in a Portmantue* once or twice a week, as the common *by-word* was then. But when, notwithſtanding all this, the grand points of the *Reſidence* and power of *Biſhops* were ſo hotly debated by the *Spaniſh Biſhops*, What arts were uſed to divert them! when that would not do, How they bait them in *Council* by the flouting *Italians!* what private *Cabals* were kept by the *Legats*, what diſpatching and poſting to *Rome*, what numbers of jolly *Italians* are made *Biſhops*, and ſent away to over-vote them? And when the *French-Biſhops* were come, what Spies did they keep upon them, what bones were thrown to divide the *French* and *Spaniſh Biſhops*, what careſſing the *Cardinal* of *Lorrain* to bring him off by the Court of *Rome*? And when any others durſt ſpeak freely, what checks, and frowns, and diſgraces did they meet with? And all this to keep the *Pope* ſafe, who was ſtill in bodily fear till the *Council* was ended to his mind; and then what rejoycing, that they had cheated the world ſo, that that which was intended to clip the wings of the Court of *Rome*, had confirmed and advanced the *Intereſt* of it. This was truly the *Head's preſiding over the members*: for all the life and motion they had, proceeded from the *Influence* of their *Head*, the *Pope*: Call you this *Preſiding in a Council?* It is rather *riding of it*, that by the *ſpurring* ſome and *bridling* others, they may go juſt as the *Pope* would have them. And that this is a true account of it, appears, notwithſtanding whatever your *Cardinal Palavicino* hath been able to object againſt the impartial hiſtory of it; whoſe two volumes pretended in Anſwer to it, conſiſt of ſo many impertinencies, and hath ſo very little material in it, that a *Roman Catholick* himſelf hath declared to the world, that he hath done more diſſervice to the *Church* of *Rome* by his *Anſwer*, than ever Father *Paul* did by his Hiſtory: By whom, his two great Books are compared to thoſe *Night-birds* that make a great ſhew, but are all Feathers and very little Fleſh. This then being the way of management of things at *Trent*, judge you or any reaſonable man, Whether the *Proteſtants* have not juſt cauſe to except againſt the *Preſidentſhip* which the *Pope* had in that *Council*; and name you

Cæſar Aquilinus de tribus hiſtoricis Concilii Trident. p. 49, 51.

you any *General Council* (that was truly accounted ſo) where ever he had any thing like it? The particulars you mention, will be conſidered afterwards.

§. 5. Ibid. But you ſay, *All this was becauſe the Pope was not juſtly accuſable of any crime, but what muſt involve not only the Council, but the whole Church as much as himſelf.* If ſo, there was the greater reaſon that he ſhould leave it to the *Church* in a *Free Council* to have impartially debated things, without his acting and interpoſing ſo much as he did. But the *Pope* was wiſer than to think ſo; he knew there were many things in the *Court* of *Rome* which many other *Biſhops* ſtruck at, as well as the *Proteſtants*; and that they deſired a *Reformation* of *Abuſes* as well as the other, eſpecially the *German*, *French*, and *Spaniſh Biſhops*. Nay, it is ſtrange to ſee how much intereſt or prejudice blinds men, that they will not acknowledge now that there was any ſuch need of *Reformation*, when *Pope Adrian 6.* confeſſed at the *Dyet* at *Norimberg*, *A. D.* 1522. by *Cheregatus* his *Legat*, that the *Popes* themſelves had been the fountain and cauſe of all thoſe evils in the Church; In theſe remarkable words (part of which have been cited already on another occaſion) *Scimus in hâc ſanctâ Sede, aliquot jam annis, multa abominanda fuiſſe, abuſus in Spiritualibus, exceſſus in mandatis, & omnia deniq; in perverſum mutata. Nec mirum, ſi ægritudo à capite in membra, à ſummis Pontificibus in alios Prælatos deſcenderit. Omnes nos (ſc. Prælati Eccleſiaſtici) declinavimus, unuſquiſq; in vias ſuas, nec fuit jamdiu, qui faceret bonum, non fuit uſq; ad unum. Quamobrem neceſſe eſt, ut omnes demus gloriam Deo, & humiliemus animas noſtras ei: videat unuſquiſq; noſtrùm unde exciderit, & ſe potius quilibet judicet, quàm à Deo in virga furoris ſui judicari velit. Qua in re quod ad nos pertinet, polliceberis, Nos omnem operam adhibituros, ut primum Curia hæc, unde forte omne hoc malum proceſſit, reformetur: ut ſicut inde corruptio in omnes inferiores emanavit, ita ab eadem ſanitas & reformatio omnium emanet. Ad quod procurandum nos tanto arctius obligatos reputamus, quando univerſum mundum hujuſmodi reformationem avidiùs deſiderare videmus.* Can you now for ſhame ſay, *There was no need of Reformation at that time, and that the Popes were no more concerned than the whole Church?* The *whole Church* was indeed concerned, to ſee the *Court of Rome* reformed, and we ſee the *Pope* confeſſeth, that all the world deſired a *Reformation*. Doth not he ingenuouſly acknowledge, *That many abominable things had been for many years in the Holy See* (and very *holy* it was, the mean time) *that all things were out of order. That the diſtemper had fallen from the Head to the members, from the Popes to other Prelates, that they had all gone out of the way, that for a long time there had been none that did good, no not one. That therefore it was neceſſary, that all ſhould give glory to God, and humble their ſouls; and every one ſee whence he was fallen, and judge himſelf, rather than be judged by God in the rod of his fury. Wherefore* (ſaith he to his Legat) *thou ſhalt promiſe for us, that we will uſe our utmoſt endeavour, that this Court, from whence all the miſchief hath proceeded, may be reformed; that as the corruption hath flowed from thence unto inferiors, ſo the health and reformation of all may come from thence too. And we look on our ſelves as the more obliged to procure this, becauſe we ſee the whole world doth earneſtly deſire ſuch a Reformation.* Whom muſt we now believe, the *Pope* or you? the *Pope ingenuouſly* and *Chriſtianly* bemoaning the *corruptions* that had been in *Popes* themſelves, and *from them* had ſpread to others; or you, who baſely and untruly flatter the *Popes*, as though they needed no Reformation, but what concerned the *Council* and *Church*, as well as them? And the *Pope* gives you the true reaſon of it, *Becauſe the corruptions had been ſo great at* Rome, *that from thence they had ſpread over all others.* And can you think now, that the *Pope* was not juſtly accuſed of

of any crime, but that he might ſit as *Preſident*, and manage the affairs of the *Council*, as though there had been no need at all of any *Reformation?* But I remember an obſervation of *Baronius*, that the providence of *God* was ſo great in watching over the *Roman See*, that the *Popes* who were unfit to Govern it, ſeldom continued long in it; which he makes upon *Siricius* his favour to *Ruffinus*; and ſuch a *Pope* was this *Adrian* accounted; this confeſſion of his being very diſtaſtful at *Rome*, he continued not long after it. But yet I know you have another Anſwer ready at hand, *That all this concerned only ſome abuſes in manners and management of affairs, but nothing confeſſed to be amiſs in Doctrine of Faith.* However, ſince it belonged to the *Council* to reform thoſe abuſes, the *Pope* as an intereſſed perſon ought not to have *preſided* there, had it not been his intention to have prevented any real *Reformation*. For all the Decrees of the *Council* to that purpoſe were meerly deluſory and nothing of *Reformation* followed upon them; and the moſt important things to that end could never paſs the *Council*. And if we gain this, that the *Pope* ought not to be *Judge*, where himſelf is concerned, as to the *Reformation* of *abuſes*; your former aſſertion will make the other follow, *viz.* that in caſe of *Hereſie*, other *Biſhops* may in *Council* proceed againſt the *Pope*, and, by the ſame reaſon, when any *errors* in Faith are charged upon him, or thoſe who joyn in Communion with him; that ſuch ought to be debated in a full and free *Council*, where no one concerned may preſide to *over-aw* the reſt. But ſuch *Preſidents* ſhould be appointed as were in former *General Councils*, to whom it belonged to manage the debates of the *Council*, without any ſuch Power and Juriſdiction over them, as the *Pope* pretended to have, over all thoſe aſſembled at *Trent*. And thus it appears, that what his Lordſhip ſaid, was juſt and true, *That it is contrary to all Law, Divine, Natural and Humane, that the Pope ſhould be chief Judge in his own Cauſe.* Your inſtances of *Pope Leo* at the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and *Alexander* at the *Council* of *Nice*, will be conſidered in their due place.

§. 6. Which that we may come to, we muſt examine *the matter of fact*, as to the *Popes preſidency in General Councils*. His Lordſhip denying, *that the Pope did preſide in the Council of* Nice, *either by himſelf or Legats, becauſe* Hoſius *was the Preſident of it*; You Anſwer, *That* Hoſius *did preſide in* Ibid. *that Council, and ſo did likewiſe* Vitus *and* Vincentius *Prieſts of* Rome, *but* (you ſay) *they all preſided as the Popes Legats and not otherwiſe. This* (you ſay) *appears by their ſubſcribing the Conciliary Decrees in the firſt place, of which no other account can be given; and becauſe* Cedrenus *and* Photius *confeſs that the Pope gave authority to this Council by his Legats; and in the old preface to the Council of* Sardica, *it is ſaid expreſly, that* Hoſius *was the Popes Legat, and the ſame acknowledged by* Hincmarus, *and* Gelaſius Cyzicenus, *whom you prove that* Photius *had read.* Theſe being then all the Evidences you produce for the *Popes* Preſidency at the *Nicene Council*, we are obliged to afford them a particular conſideration.

Your firſt argument, which *Bellarmin* and *Baronius* likewiſe inſiſt on, is the order of ſubſcription, *becauſe the name of* Hoſius *is ſet firſt*; but, if we mark it, this argument ſuppoſeth that which it ſhould prove. For thus it proceeds, *Hoſius* ſubſcribed firſt, and therefore he was the *Roman Legat*; *Hoſius* was the *Roman Legat*, and therefore he ſubſcribed firſt: For it ſuppoſeth that the *firſt Subſcription* did of *right* belong only to the *Roman Legat*; which we may as well deny, by an argument juſt like it, *Vitus* and *Vincentius* did not ſubſcribe firſt, and therefore the *Roman Legats* did not ſubſcribe firſt. But you ask, *Why then did* Hoſius *ſubſcribe before the Patriarchs, and other Biſhops, of greater dignity than himſelf?* I anſwer, *Becauſe Hoſius* was *Preſident* of the *Council*, and not they. But if you ask,

Why

Why they chose him President before others, the *Nicene Fathers* must answer you, and not I. But you say, *Cedrenus* and *Photius* confess, *That the Pope gave Authority to the Nicene Council by his Legats*; but, How comes that to prove, that *Hosius* was one of those *Legats? Photius* I am sure in his Book of the *seven Synods* (first published in *Greek* by *Justellus* out of the *Sedan Library*) says no such thing, but only mentions the two *Presbyters* who were there the *Roman-Bishops Legats*. And *Cedrenus* only mentions the *Roman Legats* amongst those who were *chief* in that *Council*, reckoning up the several *Patriarchs*. Your old preface to the *Sardican Synod* (supposed of *Dionysius Exiguus*) is no competent testimony, being of a later Author, and a *Roman* too: And *Hincmarus* is much younger than he, and therefore neither of their testimonies hath any force against the ancient Writers; neither hath that of *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, who lived under *Basiliscus A. D.* 476. And that you may not think I do you wrong, to deprive you of his testimony, you may see, How freely *Baronius* passeth his censure upon those *Acts* under the name of *Nicene Council*. *Sed, ut liberè dicam, somnia puto hæc omnia*; that I may speak freely, I account them no better than dreams: And gives this very good reason for it; because ever since the time of that *Council*, all persons have been so extremely desirous of the *Acts* of that *Council*, and yet could never obtain them. But that which comes in the rear, transcends all the rest, which is, *That* Photius, *though a Schismatical Greek, and bitter enemy of the Roman Church, witnesseth he had read this Book of* Gelasius, *and in it the above-cited testimony.* And, I pray, What follows from thence? I hope *Photius* had read many other Books in that excellent collection of his *Bibliotheca* besides this; and, Will you say, that *Photius* believed all that he there saith he had read? No, but you say, *That thereupon he confesses that the said* Hosius *was Legat for the Bishop of* Rome, *at the Council of* Nice. But you would have done well to have told us, Where this Confession is extant: for you seem to insinuate, as though it were in the same place where he mentions the reading this Book of *Gelasius*: but he only saith, That *Gelasius affirms it*, adding nothing at all of his own judgement; and in his Book of the *seven Synods*, where he declares his own mind, he only mentions *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, as the *Legats* of the *Roman See*: And brings in *Hosius* afterwards, not joyning him with *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, but with *Alexander* of *Constantinople*, and *Sylvester* and *Julius* of *Rome*, and *Alexander* and *Athanasius* of *Alexandria*, whom he makes the *Chief in the Council*. For if *Photius* had intended to have made *Hosius* one of the *Popes Legats*; there was all the reason in the world he should have set him before *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, who were only *Presbyters*. And that the *Pope* had no other *Legats* there but these *two Presbyters*, we have the consent of all the ancient *Ecclesiastical Historians*; *Eusebius* mentioning the absence of the *Roman Bishop*, because of his *Age* adds, πρεσβύτεροι ἢ ἀυτὸς παρόντες τὴν ἀυτοῦ τάξιν ἐπλήρων, *His Presbyters being present, supplied his place*; so *Theodoret the Bishop of* Rome *could not be present*, Νῦν μέντοι πρεσβυτέρους ἀπέστειλε, *but he sent two Presbyters with power to give his assent*; not to preside over the Council. To the same purpose *Sozomen*, *Nicephorus*, *Zonaras* speak. And it is very strange not one of all these *Historians* should mention this, if *Hosius* had presided there as *Legat* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*; and much more, that *Hosius* should not subscribe first in that *capacity*, but only as *Bishop* of *Corduba*; for the *Popes Legats* do not use to be so forgetful of their place and honour. It seems then very plain, that the *Pope* had no manner of *Presidency* at the *Council* of *Nice*: We come therefore to following *Councils*.

Baron. A. D. 305. *sect.* 6.

Photius in Biblioth. Cod. 88. *p.* 21.

Phot. de 7. Synod. & c. p. 163.

Eusеb. de vitâ Const. l. 3. *c.* 7. *Theod. hist. Eccles. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

Sozom. l. 1. *c.* 16. *Nicephor. l.* 8. *c.* 14.

§. 7. P. 252. You grant, *That in the second General Council*, Nectarius *Bishop of* Constantinople *was President, and not the Pope or his Legats. But the reason*

(you

(you ſay) *was, becauſe Pope* Damaſus *having firſt ſummoned that Council to be held at* Conſtantinople, *and the Biſhops of the Oriental Provinces being accordingly there met, the Pope, for ſome reaſons, altered his mind, and would have had them come to* Rome, *to joyn with the Biſhops he had there aſſembled: which the Prelates at* Conſtantinople *refuſing in a ſubmiſſive manner, alledged ſuch arguments as the Pope remained ſatisfied with them. So the Council* (you ſay) *was upon the matter held in two places, at* Rome, *and* Conſtantinople. *So that while the Pope preſided in the Council at* Rome, *and gave allowance to their proceedings at* Conſtantinople, *and that by reaſon of their entercourſe, they were looked on but as one Council in effect, and the Pope to have preſided therein.* In all this you diſcover, How much you take up things upon truſt, and utter them with great confidence, when they ſeem for your purpoſe, although they are built upon notorious miſtakes in *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*; as I ſhall make it plain to you this Anſwer of yours is. For neither was the *General Council* at *Conſtantinople* ever in the leaſt ſummoned by the *Pope*, neither did it ſit at the ſame time that the *Council* at *Rome* under *Damaſus* did; neither were any *Letters* ſent from that *Council* to the *Pope*; and therefore certainly *Pope Damaſus* could not in any ſenſe be ſaid to *preſide* there. Theſe things, I know, make you wonder at firſt; but I ſhall undertake to make it appear, How much your great *Maſters* (I need not name them to you) have abuſed your credulity in this ſtory. We are to know then, that the Emperour *Theodoſius* having been newly admitted into a ſhare of the *Empire* by *Gratian*, and the *Eaſtern* parts of it being alloted to him, he conſidering what a deplorable condition the *Churches* of thoſe parts were in, by reaſon of the *factions* and *hereſies* which were among them, judges it the beſt expedient to call a *Council* at *Conſtantinople*; to ſee if there were any hopes to bring the *Church* to any peace. For this purpoſe 150 *Biſhops* meet from the ſeveral *Provinces* at *Conſtantinople*, who condemn *Macedonius*, publiſh a new *Creed*, make ſeveral *Canons*, accept of *Gregory Nazianzen*'s reſignation of the *See* of *Conſtantinople*, chuſe *Nectarius* in his room, and on the death of *Meletius* at *Antioch*, elect *Flavianus* to ſucceed him, make a *Synodical Epiſtle* to the *Emperour Theodoſius*, giving him an account of their proceedings, and ſo diſſolve. This is the ſhort of the narration of it in *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*. But as ſoon as the report of their actions was come into the *Weſtern parts*, great diſcontents are taken at their proceedings, eſpecially at the election of *Flavianus* to the *See* at *Antioch*; becauſe the *Church* of *Rome* had declared it ſelf in favour of *Paulinus* at *Antioch*, during the life of *Meletius*, and therefore by no means would they now yield to the ſucceſſion of *Flavianus*. Upon this, *Damaſus* ſollicits the *Emperour Gratian* for a *General Council*, that the cauſe might be heard; and, that the *Eaſtern Biſhops* might meet too, he ſends other Letters to *Theodoſius* to the ſame purpoſe; upon the intimation of which, the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, who either were detained at *Conſtantinople* by ſeveral occurrences there, or were ſent again out of their *Provinces* thither, aſſemble together, and write a *Synodical Epiſtle* to *Damaſus*, *Ambroſius*, *Britton*, *Valerian*, *&c.* wherein they give an account, Why they could not come to *Rome*, becauſe the *Eaſtern Churches* could not, in ſo divided and buſie a time, be left deſtitute of their *Biſhops*, and therefore they deſire to be excuſed; but however, they had ſent *Cyriacus*, *Euſebius*, and *Priſcianus*, as their *Legats* thither. This excuſe the *Emperour Theodoſius* accepted of, and *Damaſus* and his Council were fain to reſt ſatisfied with it; only ſome of *Paulinus* his party met him there, as *Epiphanius* and S. *Hierom* (although S. *Hierom* being no Biſhop, could only ſhew his good will, and take that opportunity

Theodoret. Eccleſ. hiſt. l. 5. c. 8, 9. Socrat. l. 5. cap. 8. Sozomen. l. 7. c. 12.

of returning to *Rome*.) What this *Council* did under *Damasus*, we are to seek; for both *Baronius* and *Binius* confess, that the *Acts* of that *Council*, are wholly lost; only *Baronius* thinks, the condemnation of *Apollinaris* and *Timotheus* (which *Theodoret* mentions) to have been done before; and that *Paulinus* was restored to the *See* of *Antioch* by this *Council*: which seems the more probable, in that *Paulinus* the next year returns to *Antioch*; and because the *Bishops* of *Rome* afterwards took his part, and defended his successour against *Flavianus* in the *See* of *Antioch*. This being the true account of those proceedings, let now any indifferent person judge, Whether you were not much put to it, when you are fain to confound *two Councils*, held at several times on several occasions, on purpose to *blind* the Reader, and to make him believe that *Pope Damasus* had somewhat to do, in *calling* and *presiding* in the *General Council* at *Constantinople*; because he requested the meeting of the *Bishops* again the year after the *General Council*. And the truth of this, is so plain, that *Baronius* and *Binius* confess the difference of these two *Councils*, both as to the times and occasions of them. *Baronius* placeth the *Oecumenical Council* at *Constantinople A. D.* 381. *Eucherius* and *Syagrius* being *COSS.* in *May*: but the other *Council* at *Constantinople*, he placeth the year after, *A. D.* 382. *Syagrius* and *Antonius COSS.* at which time likewise the *Council* at *Rome* sate. And so *Binius* reckons this *Council* as a second *Council* at *Constantinople* under *Damasus*, and, in all things concerning the times of this and the former, follows *Baronius* exactly. So much are the two great *Cardinals*, *Bellarmine* and *Perron* mistaken, when they would have the *Council* at *Constantinople* called *Oecumenical* on this account, because there was a *Council* at *Rome* sitting under *Damasus*, at the same time, approving what was done at *Constantinople*. Whereas the occasion of the *Council* at *Rome* was given by some of the last Acts of the *Oecumenical Council*, *viz.* the election of *Flavianus*. But that this could not be, that those two *Councils* at *Rome* and *Constantinople*, should sit together at the same time, and on the same account, appears by the *Synodical Epistle* of the *Council* the year following sent to *Damasus*, which is exemplified both in *Binius* and *Baronius*, and is originally extant in *Theodoret*. Although *Binius* placeth it at the end of the *Oecumenical Council*, but *Baronius* much more fairly in the next year, as being the Act of the *second Council*. Now there are two things in that *Synodical Epistle* by which I shall prove it impossible, that either the Letters of *Pope Damasus* did concern the calling of the *Oecumenical Council*, or that the sitting of the *Council* at *Rome*, and the *General* one at *Constantinople*, could be at the same time. The first is from the date of those Letters, which is thus expressed there: that they met together at *Constantinople*, having received the Letters which were sent the year before from them to the *Emperour Theodosius*, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ἀκυλείᾳ σύνοδον, *after the Synod at Aquileia*. Now the *Synod* at *Aquileia* by *Baronius* his computation, was held the same year *A. D.* 381. in which the *Oecumenical Council* at *Constantinople* was held, and much later in the year too, for this was held in the *Nones* of *September*, and the other in *May*; and so much is likewise confessed by *Binius* in his notes on that *Council*. Now let me demand of you, Whether is it impossible that *Damasus* should, by his *Letters*, summon the *Oecumenical Council*, when the date of those Letters to *Theodosius*, is so long after the sitting of it? But besides this, these *Eastern Bishops* in that *Council*, which sate after these Letters of *Damasus*, clearly distinguished themselves from the *Oecumenical Council* of the year foregoing: for, after they had given a brief account of their Faith, they referr the *Pope* and *Western Council* to that declaration of Faith which had been made the

Binor. Ann. 382. *sect.* 17.

Annal. Ann. 381. *sect.* 17.

A. D. 382. *sect.* 4, *&c.*

Tom. 1. *Concil. p.* 686.

Bellarm. de Concil. l. 1. *c.* 5.

Perrons Reply. l. 1. *cap.* 34.

Bin. Tom. 1. *Concil. p.* 665. *Theod. hist. Eccles. l.* 5. *c.* 9.

A. D. 382. *sect.* 9.

Ann. 381. *sect.* 8.

Tom. 1. *Concil. p.* 682.

the *year before* by the *Oecumenical Council* assembled at *Constantinople*, πῶ πίεμοι ἐν Κωνσαντινουπόλει παρὰ τῆς οἰκεμενικῆς ἐκτεθέντι συνόδῳ. Is it possible then any thing should be more evident, than that this *Council* assembled upon the *Letters* of *Damasus* to *Theodosius*, and sitting with the *Council* at *Rome*, is clearly distinct from the *Oecumenical Council* of *Constantinople*? And thus I hope I have dispelled those *mists* which you would cast before the Readers eyes, by confounding these two *Councils*, and thereby offering to prove that the *Pope* had some kind of very remote Presidency in the second *General Council*. Which is so far from being true, that there is not any intimation in any of the ancient Historians, *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, or *Sozomen*, that the *Pope*, or any of the *Western Bishops*, had any thing at all to do in it. But you will ask, *How comes it then to be accounted an Oecumenical Council?* For this indeed *Baronius* would fain find out some hand that *Damasus* had in it, or else he cannot conceive how it should become *Oecumenical*; but all the proof he produceth, is, *Because in the Acts of the sixth Council it is said, that* Theodosius *and* Damasus *opposed* Macedonius: and so I hope he might do by declaring his consent to the Doctrine decreed in this *Council*; not that thereby his approbation made it *Oecumenical*. And, as that Doctrine was received, and that Confession of *Faith* embraced all over the world, so that *Council* became *Oecumenical*. For I cannot see but that if *Damasus* had stood up for *Macedonius*, if the Decrees against him had been received by the *Catholick Church*, it had been never the less *Oecumenical* in the sense of Antiquity: That testimony which *Baronius* brings out of his own *Library*, and a Copy of the *Vatican*, expressing that *Damasus* did summon the *Council* at *Constantinople*, is not to be taken against the consent of the ancient *Church-Historians*; it being well known what *Interess* those *Roman Copies* have a long time driven on. I deny not therefore but that the *Council* of *Constantinople* was assented to by *Damasus*, and the *Western Bishops*, in the *matters* of *Faith* there decided, but I utterly deny that *Damasus* had any thing to do in the *Presidency* over that *Council*. So that we find a *Council* alwayes acknowledged to be *Oecumenical*, in which the *Pope* had no *Presidency* at all; and this very Instance sufficiently refutes your *Hypothesis*, *viz. that the Popes Presidency is necessary to a General Council*.

In the third *General Council* held at *Ephesus A. D.* 431. it is agreed on both sides, that S. *Cyril Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, was the *President* of it: but the Question is, In what capacity he sate there, whether in his own, or as *Legat* of *Celestine Bishop* of *Rome*? All the proof you produce for the latter, is, *That it appears by a Letter written to him by the Pope, long before he sent any other Legats to that Council: in which Letter he gives S.* Cyril *charge to supply his place, as is testified by* Evagrius, Prosper, Photius, *and divers other Authors.* But here again you offer to confound two things, which are of a distinct nature: for you would have your Reader believe, that this *Letter* was sent by *Cœlestine* to *Cyril*, in order to his *Presidentship* in the *Council*, whereas this Letter was sent the *year* before, without any relation to the *Council*; as appears by the series of the story: which is briefly this; The differences in the *Eastern Churches* increasing about the Opinions broached by *Nestorius*, S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* chiefly appearing in opposition to them, they both write (much about the same time) to *Pope Cœlestine*, impeaching each other of Heresie. But before *Cœlestine* had read the Letters from *Nestorius* in vindication of himself, *Possidonius* a *Deacon* of *Alexandria* comes with several dispatches from S. *Cyril*, wherein a large account is given of the heresie and actions of *Nestorius*; upon which the *Pope* calls a *Council* at *Rome*, and therein examines the allegations on

§. 8.

P. 232.

both ſides, which being done, the *Council* condemns *Neſtorius*, and paſſeth this ſentence on him, *That ten dayes ſhould be allowed him (after notice given) for his repentance; and, in caſe of obſtinacy, he ſhould be declared excommunicate.* And for executing this ſentence, *Cœleſtine* commits his power to *Cyril*; not as though it belonged to the *Pope* only to do it, but that by this means there might appear the *Conſent* of the *Weſtern* with the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, in putting *Neſtorius* out of the communion of the *Catholick Church*. S. *Cyril* having received theſe Letters by the return of *Poſſidonius*, dated the third of the *Ides* of *Auguſt*, as appears by the Letters extant in *Baronius*, calls a *Council* at *Alexandria*, in which four *Legats* are decreed to be ſent to *Conſtantinople* in purſuance of the ſentence againſt *Neſtorius*, they deliver the Letters of *Cœleſtine* and *Cyril* to him, he returns them no anſwer at all, but addreſſes himſelf to the *Emperour Theodoſius*, and complains of the perſecutions of *Cyril*, which occaſioned a very ſharp Letter of the *Emperour* to him, charging him with diſturbing the *Churches Peace*. But this was not all; for *Cyril* having with the *Synodical Epiſtle* of the *Council* of *Alexandria*, ſent twelve *Anathematiſms* to be ſubſcribed by *Neſtorius*, he was ſo far from it, that he charges *Cyril* with the *hereſie* of *Apollinaris* in them, and ſends them to *Johannes Anthiochenus*, who (with the *Syrian Biſhops* of his *Dioceſe*) joyn with *Neſtorius* in the impeachment of *Cyril*. So that by this means the ſentence againſt *Neſtorius* could not be put in execution, becauſe of the diſſent of the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, and that S. *Cyril* ſtood charged with *Hereſie* as well as the other. Things being grown to this height, *Theodoſius* calls a *General Council* at *Epheſus*, to be held the enſuing year, writes to all the *Metropolitans* to appear there at the time appointed, and bring ſuch *Biſhops* with them, as they thought convenient; but what contentions happened there between the two parties, is not here our buſineſs to relate; but the *Emperour* foreſeeing what diſturbance was like to be there, ſent the Count *Candidianus* for better management of the affairs of the *Council*. Now S. *Cyril* and his party having the advantage of the other, both in number and forwardneſs of being there, *Cyril* ſits as *Preſident* among them. The Queſtion now is, Whether he ſate there by virtue of that *Legantine* Power he had for the excommunicating *Neſtorius* the year before, or not? or only as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and chief of that party? But by what authority he ſhould challenge to be *Preſident* of the *Council*, becauſe he had been deputed by *Cœleſtine* to act his part in the excommunicating *Neſtorius*, I think is ſomewhat hard to underſtand. Neither doth any thing appear in the *Council* which gives any ground for it; for *Cyril* ſubſcribes to it meerly as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, the Council on all occaſions call him, and *Memnon* of *Epheſus* their πρόεδρον, and when they ſpeak of *Cœleſtine*, after his *Legats* came, they ſay, He did only συνεδρεύειν, *aſſiſt together with them in Council*: But, Why ſhould *Cœleſtine* ſend other *Legats* afterwards, *viz. Arcadius*, *Philippus*, and *Projectus*, if S. *Cyril* ſupplied the *Popes* place there already? Yet, although we ſhould grant, that before the *Legats* came, *Cyril* did ſupply the place of *Cœleſtine*, it doth not follow, that he ſate *Preſident* of the *Council* on that account: but only to ſhew the concurrence of *Cœleſtine* with the *Council* in matter of Doctrine; and this there was good reaſon for, becauſe *Cœleſtine* had fully declared himſelf to *Cyril* concerning that already. And this was uſual in the *Councils*, as appears in this very *Council* by *Flavianus Biſhop* of *Philippi*; ſubſcribing likewiſe in the place of *Rufus* of *Theſſalonica*. So that if we grant *Cyril* to ſit in the *Council* as *Legat* of *Cœleſtine*, yet it doth not follow, that he was *Preſident* of the *Council* in that capacity; for the other was only to *teſtifie* his *conſent*, this required a particular *Commiſſion*

Ann. 430. *Sect.* 23, 25.

miſſion to that purpoſe. So that he might give a *vote* in the *Council* for *Cæleſtine*, and yet ſit (as he did) *Preſident* of the *Council* as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*. Thus it being manifeſted, that in the three firſt General *Councils*, the *Pope* ſate not either by himſelf or his *Legats* as *Preſident*, it is ſufficiently proved thereby, that his *Preſidency* is no neceſſary condition to a *General Council*; and if not, then we ſay, It is unjuſt and unreaſonable he ſhould challenge it, when he is the perſon mainly accuſed. But in the mean while it is not at all neceſſary, that we ſhould deny that ever he ſate as *Preſident* in any other *General Council*; for being the *Biſhop* of the *chief See*, Why ſhould he in a caſe of general concernment to the *Church*, as that of *Chalcedon*, not be allowed by his *Legats* to have the *prime place?* But there wants ſufficient evidence too, that theſe were properly the *Preſidents* of that *Council*. In the next at *Conſtantinople* you grant, that *Eutychius Biſhop of Conſtantinople* ſate *Preſident*; but you ſay, *That he acknowledged this priviledge to be due to Pope Vigilius*. But, How came it to paſs then, that he would not ſit there, though then at *Conſtantinople?* It appears by the many frivolous *excuſes* he made, that he durſt not truſt himſelf in the *Council*, for fear that authority ſhould not be given him which he expected. For that hath alwayes been the ſubtilty of the *Popes* in thoſe elder times, when they began to encroach, not to venture themſelves in preſence in a *General Council*, for fear of oppoſition, but by their abſence they reſerved to themſelves a liberty to declare their diſſent, when any Acts paſſed which did not pleaſe them. As *Leo* did in the caſe of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. But however, this is evident from the fifth *General Council*, that the *Popes* Preſidency was not then thought at all neceſſary. What was done in following *Councils*, is not material to our purpoſe, becauſe it doth already ſufficiently appear, that the *Popes Preſidency* is not neceſſary to a *General Council*, and therefore you conclude with a notorious falſity, in ſaying with *Bellarmin*, *That the Pope hath been poſſeſt full* 1500 *years of the right of preſiding in General Councils*.

His Lordſhips third exception againſt the *Council* of *Trent*, is, *That the place was not free, but either in, or too near the Popes dominions*. To this you Anſwer, *That certainly* Trent *is not within the Popes dominion*: but it is well enough known, that *Trent* was under the ſole juriſdiction of the *Biſhop*, and the *Biſhop* to be ſure was under the *Popes* dominion, having been particularly obliged too, by receiving a *Cardinal's Hat*. And therefore it was not without juſt reaſon that the *place* was proteſted againſt, not only by the *German Proteſtants*, as being out of *Germany* where the *States* of the *Empire* had often promiſed the *Council* ſhould be; at the Diet at *Norimberg* 1524, at *Auſpurg* 1526. *Spire* 1529. *Ratisbone* 1532, 1541. again at *Norimberg* 1543. and laſt of all at *Spire* 1544. but as a moſt inconvenient *place* for them to come to; being *a weeks journey* (as they ſay) from the borders of *Germany*, ſeated in a barren and almoſt inacceſſible place, having no freedom of paſſage almoſt amidſt the *Alps*; This place, I ſay, was not only proteſted againſt by them, as being contrary to the promiſes made to them; but the *German Biſhops* made it their earneſt requeſt, that the *Council* might be held in *Germany*; for at *Trent*, they ſaid they could neither be preſent themſelves, nor ſend any *Legats* thither: and particularly inſtance in the unpaſſableneſs of the *Alps* between them and *Trent*; and that it was rather in the borders of *Italy* than *Germany*. And the *Pope* himſelf in his Anſwer to the *German Biſhops*, and the *Emperours Proteſtation* upon the removal of the *Council* from *Trent* to *Bononia*, inſiſts upon the inconvenience of *Trent* for the long reſidence of the *Biſhops* there. And in behalf of the *Proteſtants* declaring againſt this *place* in regard of the unſafeneſs of it, the places about being all under the

§. 9. Ibid.

Popes

Review of the Council of Trent, l. 1. c. 7.

Popes authority: *du Ranchin* tells you, *That it is an exception allowable by the Doctors of the Canon Law, who all agree, that an exception against the safety of the place is pertinent, and ought to be admitted; that it is good, both by the Civil Law and the Law of Nature, that a man summon'd to a place where any danger threatens him, is not bound to appear, nor to send his Proctour, and that a Judge is bound to assign the parties a place of safety for the hearing of their cause, otherwise there is just cause of appeal.* That the *Council* of *Pisa* excepted against appearing at *Rome* on the same accounts, and if they durst not venture to *Rome* upon the offer of safe-conduct, much less reason had the Protestants to do it, to such a place as *Trent*, a City, by reason of the neighbouring woods very subject to treacheries and ambushments; that the very designing such a place yielded ground of fear and suspicion, especially to such as had not forgotten the late examples of *John Husse*, and *Hierom* of *Prague* at the *Council* of *Constance*. That the *States* of *Germany* in the *Diet* at *Francford A. D.* 1338. pleaded the nullity of the *Popes* excommunication of *Lewis* 5, because he was cited to *Avignon* where the *Pope* was *Lord* of the *place*; and the place being not free for him to appear at, the summons were not *Canonical*, but void and invalid in Law. This and many other instances are there brought by the same learned *Authour* to justifie the *Protestants* in not appearing at *Trent*, because the place was not free nor safe; although the Authour seems not to have been one himself. All these things being considered, he must have been an *Infidel indeed*, who would pronounce *Trent* to have been the most indifferent place for both parties to meet at. For what you say, *That it might have been as unsafe for the Pope and his party, if it had been in* Germany: there is no reason at all for it, because of the *Emperours* openly owning that Interest; but if you plead the Wars of *Germany* which then broke out, I hope that may serve as a further plea for the *Protestants*, who were in a good condition to go to a free *Council* about matters of *Religion*, when a War was already begun upon them upon the account of *Religion*, as most evidently appears, not only by the supplies sent by the *Pope*, but by the transactions afterwards between the *Pope* and the *Emperour*, in some of which it is expressly confessed.

§. 10. But supposing the place had been never so free, there is another great Exception remaining still, *viz. That none had suffrage, but such as were sworn to the Pope and Church of* Rome, *and professed enemies to all that call'd for*

P. 233. *Reformation or a free Council.* To this you Answer, 1. *That it is no new thing for Bishops to take an oath of Canonical obedience to the Pope; for St.* Gregory *mentions it as an ancient custome in his time; and therefore this objection would serve as much against ancient General Councils as this of* Trent. 2. *That the Bishops oath doth not deprive them of the liberty of their suffrage; nay it doth not so much as oblige them not to proceed and vote even against the Pope himself, if they see just cause; but only that they will be obedient to him, so long as he commands things suitable to the will of God and the Sacred Canons of the Church.* But what falshood and fraud lies in both these Answers, it will not take up much time to discover. Could you without blushing offer to say, *That no other oath was taken by the Bishops at the Council of* Trent *than what was taken in ancient General Councils?* for so much your words imply, when you say, *That the same objection would have held as well against them as this of* Trent. Why do you not produce some instance of any *oath* taken to the *Pope* in any of the first *General Councils?* I dare challenge you to bring any footsteps of any such thing in any ancient *Council*; and you must needs have exceedingly hardened your forehead that durst let fall any thing tending that way. It was in much later times before that oath of *Canonical Obedience* from *Bishops* to their *Metropolitan*

politan came up; and when it did, no more took any ſuch oath to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, than ſuch as were under his *Metropolitical juriſdiction*. In your citation of *Gregory*, you would let us ſee how far you can out-go *Bellarmin* himſelf in theſe things. For *Bellarmin* only proves, that it is not new for *Biſhops* to take an *oath* of *Canonical Obedience* to the *Pope*; but you ſay, *That* Gregory *mentions it as an ancient cuſtome in his time*, which is egregiouſly falſe. For there is not one word in all that *Epiſtle* implying any thing of former cuſtome, neither doth it contain an oath of *Canonical obedience* made by every *Biſhop* at his Conſecration, but only a *Form* of renunciation of Hereſie by any *Biſhop* who comes off from it to the *Catholick Church*, and ſo the title of it is, *Promiſſio cujuſdam Epiſcopi hereſin ſuam anathematizantis*; and what is this, I pray, to the oath taken by every *Biſhop* at his conſecration? wherein he ſwears, *to defend and retain the Roman Papacy, and the Royalties of St.* Peter (ſo their new *Pontifical* hath it, whereas in the old one it was *regulas Sanctorum Patrum*) *againſt all men*. And was this no more than a bare Oath of *Canonical obedience*? The firſt mention we meet with of any Oath of *Canonical obedience* taken by men in *Orders*, is in the eleventh *Council of Toledo* cap. 10. held, ſaith *Loayſa*, *A. D.* 675. and therein indeed they ſay it is *expedibile*, a matter they judge *expedient*, *That thoſe in orders ſhould*, Promiſſionis ſuæ vota ſub cautione ſpondere, *bind themſelves by promiſe to obſerve the Catholick Faith, and obey their Superiours*: but here is nothing at all concerning any oath to be taken by all *Biſhops* to the *Pope*, though *Bellarmine* produce it to that purpoſe. For that was much later than the time of this *Council*, it beginning at the time of the conteſts between the *Popes* and *Princes* about *Inveſtitures*; then the *Pope* to ſecure as many as he could to himſelf, binds them in Oath of *Fealty* and *Allegiance*, rather than *Canonical Obedience* to himſelf: by which, as *Spalatenſis* truly ſaith, *he makes the Biſhops his ſlaves and vaſſals*. And therefore in another place, he juſtly wonders, that any *Chriſtian Princes* will ſuffer any *Biſhops* to make that *Homage* by this Oath to the *Pope*, which is only due to themſelves. For, ſaith he, *That Oath which was only of Canonical obedience before, they have turned it into abſolute homage to the Pope, ſo that none can be conſecrated Biſhops without it*. But yet you would perſwade us, *that notwithſtanding this Oath they may proceed and vote againſt the Pope himſelf*. Surely, Pope *Pius* 2. was of another mind, who (as the *Appendix* to *Urſpergenſis* tells us) in an Epiſtle to the Chapter at *Mentz*, ſaith, *That to ſpeak truth againſt the Pope, is to break their Oath*. But all this will more evidently appear, if we produce the form of the Oath it ſelf, I mean not that in the old *Roman Pontifical*, but that which was taken in *Julius* the *third*'s time, which was in the time of the ſitting of the *Council* of *Trent*. In which, beſides in the firſt place a promiſe of obedience to the Pope and his Succeſſours, and a promiſe of concealment of all his *Councils*, there are theſe expreſs words, *Jura, honores, privilegia, & authoritatem Romanæ Eccleſiæ, Domini noſtri Papæ & ſucceſſorum prædictorum conſervare, defendere, augere, & promovere curabo. I will take care to preſerve, defend, increaſe, and promote the rights, honours, priviledges, and authority of the Roman Church, and of our Lord the Pope and his Succeſſours aforeſaid*; but leſt this ſhould not be full enough, there follows another clauſe, *Nec ero in Concilio, in facto, ſeu tractatu, in quibus contra Dominum noſtrum, vel Romanam Eccleſiam, aliqua ſiniſtra ſive præjudicialia perſonarum, juris, honoris, ſtatus, & poteſtatis eorum, machinentur. Et, ſi talia à quibuſdam tractari cognovero, aut procurari, impediam hoc pro poſſe; & quantocyus potero commodè ſignificabo eidem Domino noſtro, vel alteri per quem ad ipſius notitiam poſſit pervenire. I will not be in any Council, action, or debate, in which they ſhall plot or contrive any thing to the prejudice of our Lord the Pope*

De Concil. l. 1. c. 22.

Greg. ep. l. 10. c. 33.

De Repub. Eccleſ. Tom. 1. l. 4. c. 7. ſect. 52. Tom. 2. l. 6. c. 7. n. 102.

Proteſtatio adverſus Concil. Trident. p. 22. A. D. 1563.

or the Roman Church, or of any perſons, right, honour, ſtate or power, belonging to them. Was not this now a fit Oath to ſend Biſhops to a free Council with? where the main thing to have been debated had been the uſurped power of the *Pope* and *Church* of *Rome*. He that can believe a *Council* made up of ſuch perſons (who judge this Oath lawful) to be *Free*, may think thoſe men free to rebel againſt their *Soveraign*, who had but juſt taken an Oath of *Allegiance* to him. Not that the *Pope* had any right or power to impoſe it, or that the Oath is in it ſelf lawful; but that thoſe who judged both theſe things true, could not poſſibly be more obliged, not to act in any meaſure againſt the *Pope* than they were. And therefore the *Pope* knew what he did, when he utterly denied to abſolve the *Biſhops* of this Oath, which the *States* of the *Empire* preſſed him to, as neceſſary in order to the *Freedom* of the *Council*: *No*, ſaid he, *I do not mean to have my hands bound up ſo.* He knew well enough, how much his *Intereſt* lay at ſtake, if the *Biſhops* were releaſed of this *Oath*, and therefore he was reſolved to hold them faſt enough to himſelf by it. What reſtrictions or limitations can you now find out in this Oath, whereby theſe *Biſhops* might freely debate the power and authority of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*? They that ſwear, *not to be in any Council or debate againſt the Pope*, are not like to make any *Free Council* about the matters then in Diſpute. And, Do you think now the *Proteſtants* had no cauſe to except againſt this *Council*, where all the *Biſhops* were ſwore before-hand to maintain and defend that which they moſt complained of? And, Were there nothing elſe but this *Oath*, ſo unheard of a thing in all ancient *Councils*, ſo contrary to the ends of a *Free Council*; this were enough to keep them from ever ſubmitting to the judgement of ſuch a *Council* as that of *Trent* was.

And yet this is not all neither: for his Lordſhip adds, *That the Pope himſelf, to ſhew his charity, had declared and pronounced the Appellants Hereticks, before they were condemned by the Council. I hope*, ſaith he, *an Aſſembly of enemies are no lawful Council; and I think that the Decrees of ſuch a one are*, omni jure nulla, *and carry their nullity with them through all Law.* Ibid. All the Anſwer you give to this, is, *That the Pope did nothing therein but in purſuance of the Canons of the Church which required him ſo to do, and of the Decrees of General Councils, which had already condemned their Opinions for Hereſie.* You mend the matter well: for it ſeems the *Pope* not only did ſo, but was bound to do ſo. For ſhame then never talk of a *Free* and *General Council*, to debate thoſe things which you ſay were already condemned for Hereſies by *General Councils*. One may now ſee, What the *Safe-conduct* had been for the *Proteſtants*, if they had come to *Trent*; for it ſeems they were condemned for *Hereticks* before they came there, and nothing then was wanting but execution. But if the *Proteſtants* Opinions were condemned for *Hereſies* before by *General Councils*, Why was the *Council* of *Trent* at all ſummoned? Why was the world ſo deceived with the promiſes of a *Free* and *General Council*? Why did they proceed to make new *Decrees* in theſe matters? In what ancient *General Councils* will you ſhew us the *Popes Supremacy*, the *Infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome* decreed, that thoſe who held the contrary ſhould be accounted *Hereticks*? Speak them out, that we may find our ſelves therein condemned. Give us a *Catalogue* of the reſt of your *Tridentine Articles*, and name us the *General Councils* in which they were decreed as they are there? But this is not a work for you to meddle in. However, What folly and madneſs would it be to account that a *Free Council*, in which the things to be debated are looked on as condemned Hereſies already, and no liberty allowed to any perſons to debate them?

The

The laſt Exception you ſay of his Lordſhip, is, *againſt the ſmall number of Biſhops preſent at the Tridentine Council; and in the firſt place he mentions the Greeks whom he takes* (ſay you) *to have been unjuſtly excluded.* To this you ſay, 1. *The Pope called all who had right to come:* (*you ſhould ſay, all whom he would judge to have right to come.*) 2. *The Greeks, by reaſon of their notorious Schiſm, had excluded themſelves:* And, Might not the *Greeks* (if they were in condition) every whit as well hold a *General Council* among themſelves, and ſay, The *Latins* had excluded themſelves by their notorious *Schiſm?* You ſay, *It is confeſſed that no known Heretick or Schiſmatick, hath right to ſit in Council:* but ſtill you make your own ſelves Judges, Who are Oxthodox, and who Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; and, Might not the *Greeks* again ſay the very ſame of you? and for all that I know, with much more truth and reaſon. It was then very like to be a *General Council*, when the *Pope* and his party muſt ſit as *Judges*, Who were to be admitted, and who not: Might not the *Donatiſts* in *Africa* have call'd their *Council* of *ſeventy Biſhops* an *Oecumenical Council* upon the ſame grounds, becauſe they accounted none to belong to the Church, but ſuch as were of their own party? And if they did not belong to the *Church*, they could have no right to ſit in *Council*. It ſeems, the more uncharitable you are, the freer your *Councils* are; For the *Pope* may, by pronouncing men *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, keep them from coming to *Councils*, and appearing againſt him there: and the *Council* be never the leſs *General* for all that. If the *Greeks* be not called to the *Council*, they may thank themſelves, they are *notorious Schiſmaticks*, and, if we believe you, *Hereticks* too; If the *Proteſtants* be not admitted, it is their own fault they are condemned *Hereticks*; if none appear from any other more remote *Churches*, ſtill the ſame plea will ſerve to exclude them all. For my part I much approve the ſaying of *Eugenius* in the *Council* of *Florence*, when they ſpake of the paucity of *Biſhops* for a *General Council*, *That where he and the Emperour, and the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople *were preſent, there was a General Council, though there were no more.* And *Pope Pius the fourth* might have ſaved a great deal of money in his purſe, with which he maintained his *Biſhops Errant* at that *Council*, had he been of the ſame mind. But the ſcene of things was altered in *Europe*; there were ſuch clamours made for a *General Council*, that ſomething muſt be done to ſatisfie the world: and, as long as the *Pope* knew how to manage the buſineſs, there would be nothing could breed ſo great danger in it. He therefore barely ſummons a *Council*, without acquainting any of the *Eaſtern Patriarchs* with it (as was the cuſtome in the ancient *General Councils*) among whom it was debated after the *Emperours* indicting of it; theſe ſummoned by the *Emperours* order their *Metropolitans*, the *Metropolitans* the *Biſhops*; the *Biſhops* they agreed among themſelves, who ſhould go to the *Council*, who on that account might be ſaid to repreſent thoſe *Churches* from whence they came. What was there like this in the Council of *Trent?* What meſſages were there ſent to the *Eaſtern Patriarchs* of *Conſtantinople*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria?* What *Metropolitans* came thence? What *Biſhops* by the conſent of thoſe Churches? And, if there were nothing of all this, What boldneſs is it to call this a *General Council?* Juſt by the ſame figure that your *Church* is called the *Catholick Church*; which is, by an inſufferable *Catachreſis*. And muſt ſix fugitive *Greek-Biſhops* give vote here for all the *Eaſtern Churches*; and two fugitive *Engliſh-Biſhops* for all the *Church* of *England?* I do not then at all wonder, How eaſily this might be a *General Council*, though there were ſo very few perſons in moſt of the *Seſſions* of it. But you ſay, *There was no need of any particular ſending from the Greeks, as the caſe then ſtood, and ſtill continues; 'tis ſufficient they were called by*

§. 11. Ibid.

P. 234.

the Pope. Sufficient indeed for your purpoſe; but not at all for a *General Council*; For if the *Greek Churches* had been in condition to have ſent an equal number of *Eaſtern* to *Weſtern Biſhops*, the *Popes* would rather have loſt all, than ſtood to the judgement of ſuch a *Council*. And this you know well enough, for all your ſaying, *That the Greek Church condemns the Proteſtants*: You dread the *Greek Churches* meeting you in a *Free General Council*; and therefore to prevent that, they muſt be called *Schiſmaticks*, and excluded as ſuch, though you would never permit the debate of the *Schiſm* in a *Free Council*. *As the caſe then ſtood, and ſtill continues, there was no need of ſending*. And, Why ſo? Is it becauſe thoſe *Churches* were then under perſecutions, and are ſtill, and therefore there is no hopes that the *Biſhops* ſhould come to a *General Council?* But all that thence follows, is, that as things ſtood then, and do ſtill, there can be no truly *General Council*; and that is a juſt inference: but I ſuppoſe you rather mean, becauſe thoſe *Churches* were then in *Schiſm*, and are ſtill, which ſtill diſcovers what a wonderful good opinion you have of your ſelves, and how uncharitable you are to all others. And ſo great is the excellency of your *Biſhops*, that one of them may repreſent a *whole Nation*; and ſo about *fifty* will be more than ſufficient for the whole world. And therefore I rather wonder there were ſo many *Biſhops* at *Trent*; for, if the *Pope* pleaſed, as he made *Patriarchs*, *Primats*, and *Arch-Biſhops* of ſuch places where they never durſt go (which he knew well enough) it had been but appointing ſuch to ſtand for ſuch a *Nation*, and ſuch for another, and a ſmall number might have ſerved turn, without putting any to the trouble of coming from any forraign *Countreys* at all. For otherwiſe, if we go about to examine the numbers of *Biſhops*, by their proportions to the *Churches* they come from, as it ought to be in *General Councils*, we ſhall find a moſt pitiful account in the *Council* of *Trent*.

§. 12. P. 215. For as his Lordſhip ſaith, *Is it to be accounted a General Council, that in many Seſſions had ſcarce ten Arch-Biſhops, or forty or fifty Biſhops preſent? In all the Seſſions under* Paul 3. *but two Frenchmen, and ſometimes none; as in the ſixth, under* Julius 3. *when* Henry 2. *of* France *proteſted againſt that Council. And from* England *but one or two* (by your own confeſſion) *and thoſe not ſent by Authority. And the French* (he ſaith) *held off till the Cardinal of* Lorrain *was got to* Rome. *As for the Spaniards, they laboured for many things upon good grounds, but were moſt unworthily over-born.* Now to this you have a double Anſwer ready, 1. *That miſſion or deputation, is not of abſolute neceſſity, but only of Canonical proviſion, when time or ſtate of the Countreys whence Biſhops are ſent, will permit; in other caſes, it ſufficeth they be called by the Pope.* 2. *For thoſe who were abſent, the impediment was not on the Councils part; and in the latter Seſſions* (*wherein all that had been formerly defined by the Council, was* de Novo *confirmed and ratified by the unanimous conſent of all the Prelates*) *'tis manifeſt, the Council was ſo full, that in the number of Biſhops it exceeded ſome of the firſt four General Councils.* I begin with your firſt Anſwer, which neceſſarily implies, that a *General Council* is not ſo called by *repreſentation* of the *whole Church*, but by relation to the *Popes Summons*. So that if the *Pope* make a *General Summons*, that muſt be called a *General Council*, though none be preſent but ſuch whom the *Pope* ſhall think fit to call thither. But, Where do you find any ſuch account of a *General Council* in all *Antiquity?* I have given you inſtances already of *General Councils*, in which the *Popes* had nothing at all to do with the ſummoning of them; nay, all the four *General Councils* were called by the *Emperour*, and not by the *Pope*, as any one may ſee, that doth not wilfully blind himſelf. The *Pope* ſometimes did beſeech and intreat the *Emperour* to call a *Council*, but never preſumed to do it himſelf

Ibid.

in

in thoſe dayes. And this is evident, not only from the *Hiſtorians*, but from the authentick *Acts* of the *Councils* themſelves; and *Cardinal Perron*'s diſtinction of the *temporal and ſpiritual call of Councils*, is as ill grounded as the *Popes temporal and ſpiritual power*; there being no foundation at all in *Antiquity*, nor any reaſon in the thing, for two ſuch ſeveral *Calls*, the one by the *Emperour*, and the other by the *Pope*. But this is a meer evaſion, the evidence being ſo clear, as to the *Emperours* calling thoſe *Councils*, the *Nicene* by *Conſtantine*, the *Conſtantinopolitan* by *Theodoſius*, the *Epheſine* by the *Junior Theodoſius*, the *Chalcedonian* by *Martian* and *Valentinian*: And this is ſo clear, that *Bellarmine* in his *Recognitions* confeſſeth his miſtake *about the Conſtantinopolitan Council being called by the Letters of Pope* Damaſus; and acknowledges that to be true, which I at large proved before, *That the Synodical Epiſtle was not ſent by the General Council, but by another the year after.* If then the calling of *Councils* belongs not of right to the *Pope*, it is not his ſummoning which can make a *General Council*, without miſſion and deputation from thoſe *Churches* whom they are to repreſent. And any other ſenſe of a *General Council* is contrary to the ſenſe of *Antiquity*, and is forced, and unreaſonable in it ſelf. For it muſt be either abſolutely *general*, or by *repreſentation*; none ever imagined yet an abſolutely *General Council*, and therefore it muſt be ſo called as it doth *repreſent*; if ſo, then there is a neceſſity of ſuch a *deputation*. But here a *Queſtion* might ariſe, Whether thoſe *Deputies* of *Churches* have power by their own votes to oblige the *Churches* they are ſent from, by convening in a *General Council*; or elſe only as they carry with them the ſenſe of thoſe *Churches* whom they repreſent: and this latter ſeems more agreeable to the nature of a truly *General Council*, whoſe acts muſt oblige the whole *Church*. For that can only be ſaid to be the act of the whole *Church*, which is done by the *Biſhops* delivering the *ſenſe* of all *particular Churches*; and it is not eaſie to underſtand, How the *Univerſal Church* can be obliged any other way; unleſs it be proved, that *General Councils* are inſtituted by ſome poſitive *Law of Chriſt*; ſo that what is done by the *Biſhops* in them, muſt oblige the *Catholick Church*; and then we muſt find out not only the *Inſtitution* it ſelf, but the way and manner how *General Councils* ſhould be called, of which the *Scripture* is wholly ſilent. And therefore there is no reaſon that there ſhould be any other *General Council* imagined, but by ſuch a *repreſentation*; and in order to this, the conſent of all thoſe *Churches* muſt be known by the particular *Biſhops*, before they can concurr with others, ſo as to make a *General Council*. The moſt ſuitable way then to a *General Council*, is, that the *Summons* of them being publiſhed by the conſent of *Chriſtian Princes*, every *Prince* may call together a *National Synod*, in which the matters to be debated in the *Council*, are to be diſcuſſed, and the ſenſe of that *Synod* fully declared, which thoſe *Biſhops* who are appointed by it to go to the *General Council*, are to carry with them, and there to declare the ſenſe of their particular *Church*, and what all theſe *Biſhops* ſo aſſembled do all agree in, as the ſenſe of the whole *Church*, may be called the decree of a *General Council*. Or in caſe ſome great impediment happen, that ſuch *Biſhops* cannot aſſemble from all *Churches*, but a very conſiderable number appearing and declaring themſelves, which upon the firſt notice of it, is univerſally received by all particular *Churches*, that may *ex poſt-facto* be called a *General Council*; as it was with the firſt four *Oecumenical Councils*. And yet that in them there was ſuch a *deputation* as this is, appears by that *expreſſion* in the *Synodical Epiſtle* of the *Biſhops* of *Conſtantinople* before mentioned; for in that they give this account, Why they could not do what the *Weſtern Biſhops* deſired, *becauſe they brought not with them the conſent of the Biſhops, who remained at home*

Renoguitt. p. 46.

Tom. 1. Concil. p. 667. *to that purpose.* Καὶ περὶ ταύτης μόνης τῆς συνόδου, τὴν ἐν Τ ἐπαρχίας μεινάντων ἐπισκόπων συγκατάθεσιν ἐπαγόμεθα. *And concerning this only Council,* viz. *at* Constantinople, *have we brought the consent of those Bishops which remain in the Provinces.* So that they looked on the consent of the other *Bishops*, to be necessary as well as their own. But now, if we examine your *Council* of *Trent* by this Rule, How far is it from any appearance of a *General Council?* What *Bishops* were there sent from the most of *Christian Churches?* Those that did appear, What equality and proportion was there among them? For Voices in *General Councils* ought not to go by the number of *Bishops*, but by the number of *Churches*; so that if *six* were sent from the *Church* of *England*, or *France*, delivering the sense of that *Church* they come from, they have equal *Votes* with the greatest number of *Italian Bishops.* But here lay the great imposture of that *Council*; first, that the *Councils* being *general*, depended upon the *Popes* general *Summons*, though never so few *Bishops* appeared; next that the *Decrees* of the *Council* were to be carried by most *Voices*, and the *Bishops* to give their bare *placet*; these things being thus laid, when there was any fear that businesses would not go right, it was but the *Legats* using some art in delaying it, and sending intelligence to *Rome*, and forty *Bishops* are made together, and posted to *Trent*, to help out the number of voices; and thus it was in the case of the *Institution* and *Residence* of *Bishops*: And this is that you call, a *General Council.* 2. To your other, *That what was wanting in number at first, was made up at last when all former Decrees were confirmed by a full number of Bishops*; it is soon replyed, That this is, as all the rest of the proceedings of that *Council* was, but a meer *Artifice.* For it appears by the *History* of that *Council*, that in the last *Session* under *Pius* 4. a Proposition was made, that all the *Decrees* under *Paul* and *Julius* should be approved; which was opposed, because they said it would be a derogation to the *Authority* of the *Council* of those times, if it should seem that the things then done had need of a new confirmation of the *Fathers*, and would shew, that this and that was not all one, because none can confirm his own things. But upon the *French Bishops* earnest insisting upon it, it was determined *simply to read them, and no more.* And, Do you call this a *confirming and ratifying them* de novo? So that, for all appears by this last *Session*, the *Authority* of those *Decrees*, must, as far as concerns the *Council*, depend upon the number of the *Bishops* then present, which was but very small certainly for a *General Council*, there being not so many in most of the *Sessions*, as were in the *Donatists Council* in *Africa*; so far were they from the number of the ancient General Councils.

Hist. Council of *Trent*. l. 8. p. 804.

§. 13. Ibid. n. 4. But here comes your grand Objection in the way, *That nothing is pretended by us against the Council of* Trent, *which might not have been in effect as justly objected by the Arrians against the Council of* Nice. But, Is not there easily discernable a vast disparity between these two, which way soever we conceive them? The one called by the *Emperour*, who in person sate in the *Council*, to prevent all disorders and clancular actions; the other by the *Pope*, who presided in it by his *Legats*, and ordered all things by his directions. In that of *Nice*, the *Arrian Bishops* were as freely admitted to debate, as any of the other; but it was far from being so at the *Council* of *Trent.* In the *Nicene Council*, though *Alexander* was no further a party as to the *Doctrine* than the other *Bishops* (no more was *Leo* at the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, or *Cyril* at *Ephesus*, though those are the three you instance in before) yet he sate not as *President* of the *Council*, but the *Emperour* had the chief Inspection for the right management of it, and for the *Conciliar* actions *Hosius* was *President*: Would the *Pope* have been contented with such a *Council* in his case, wherein the *Emperour*

P. 230. n. 2.

should

ſhould have ſate in chief, and ſome other perſon beſides the *Pope* to have *preſided?* If not, never go about to parallel theſe two *Councils* with each other. Again, in the *Council* of *Nice*, all the *Biſhops* came free, without any preengagement to maintain the party of *Alexander*; but the *Biſhops* at *Trent* were all ſworn to defend the *Papal Intereſt*. At *Nice*, the *Biſhops* themſelves debated the matters in *Controverſie*; at *Trent*, the *Divines* diſpute, the *Biſhops* in their formalities give their *Placet*. At *Nice*, every one was freely heard, none died for grief of *checks* being given them for their too free ſpeaking, as there did at *Trent*. And theſe, I hope, ſhew, there was much greater reaſon for the *Proteſtants* to except againſt the *Council* of *Trent*, than for the *Arrians* againſt the *Council* of *Nice*. And yet, beſides all theſe grounds of diſparity, thoſe two remain good ſtill, which his Lordſhip inſtanceth in, *viz. That the Council of* Nice *proceeded wholly by the Scripture, and that the ſentence of it hath been univerſally received by the Church, both before and after it*; neither of which can be ſaid of the *Council* of *Trent*. But to theſe two you offer ſomething by way of Anſwer. To the firſt, *That both theſe Councils had the Scripture for their Rule, but not their only Rule; for, you ſay,* Theodoret *expreſly ſayes, that in condemning the Arrian Hereſie, the Council of* Nice *grounded it ſelf upon Tradition.* But *Theodoret* ſayes no ſuch thing; only out of an *Epiſtle* of *Athanaſius*, he ſayes, *When the Arrians objected that they uſed words not contained in Scripture, they gave them this Anſwer, that ſo did they too; but the words which they uſed, were ſuch as their Fathers had uſed before them*; and, Do you call this the grounding the condemnation of them upon *Tradition?* Yet, to do you right, I muſt ſuppoſe that either you took this upon truſt, without ſearching *Theodoret*; or, if you did, you looked no further than *Chriſtophorſons Tranſlation*, which in things concerning the *Papal Controverſies*, doth notoriouſly trip (to ſay no worſe of it, as it were eaſie to manifeſt from ſeveral examples) but we need no more than this preſent. For whereas the words in *Greek* run thus, Ἐξ ἀγράφων γὰρ ἀσεβήσαντες (ἄγραφα γὰρ τὸ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, καὶ τὸ μὴν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν) αἰτῶνται ὅτι ἐξ ἀγράφων μετ' εὐσεβείας ἐνομοθετήθησαν. Which *Sirmondus* faithfully renders, *Nam cùm ipſi ex verbis non-ſcriptis impietatem ſuam adſtruxerint: (nuſquam enim ſcriptum reperias Ex non extantibus; aut, Erat quando non erat;) accuſant quod per votes non-ſcriptas, piè tamen excogitatas, condemnati ſint, i.e.* Though the Arrians made uſe of unwritten words themſelves; yet they accuſed their adverſaries for condemning them by unwritten words; meaning the ὁμοούσιον. But *Chriſtophorſon* tranſlates αἰτῶνται, *afferunt*, and there ends the ſentence, and then makes a new ſentence. *Quapropter ex non-ſcriptis vocibus, piè tamen excogitatis, condemnati ſunt.* By this we ſee, What neceſſity there is of ſearching your Citations in *Antiquity*, which you deliver with ſo much confidence, as though none had ever looked into the *Fathers* but your ſelves. But I find you ſo often tripping in your *quotations*, that where *Bellarmine* hath been abuſed by the *Latin Interpreter*, you very ſecurely follow him in it; as in another place mentioned in this Chapter, where *Chriſtophorſon* renders ἐκ τῆς πίστεως γραμμάτων, *mandato literarum*, which *Bellarmine* confidently cites, as importing *Damaſus his power to ſummon the Council of* Conſtantinople, than which nothing can be further from the meaning of thoſe words. Thus you ſee, how vain your attempt is, of proving that the *Council* of *Nice* grounded her definition on *Tradition*, as the *Council* of *Trent* did, which is directly contrary to the advice of *Conſtantine*, and the *Proceedings* of the *Council*, as his Lordſhip truly told you. To the ſecond concerning the conſent of the Church, you anſwer, *That the like conſent of the Church both is, and was, when Proteſtants firſt began.* But, Will this

P. 216.

P. 235. *Hiſt. l. 1. c. 8.*

reach

reach to a *Parity*, if it were granted? for his Lordſhip ſpeaks of the *Conſent* of the *Church* in all ages, from the *Primitive* and *Apoſtolical times*. I pray, prove your *Maſs*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Worſhip of Images*, *Purgatory*, *&c.* by ſuch a *Conſent* as this, and then you may ſay, There is no ſuch diſparity between them: As to what you further add of the *Council* of *Nice*, condemning the *Quartodecimani* for *Hereticks*, I know not where you will find it, I am ſure *Conſtantine* is far from ſaying ſo in his *Epiſtle* perſwading to Union as to that matter. Cannot the *Council* of *Nice* appoint time to celebrate *Eaſter?* or determine, that thoſe who come from *Hereticks*, ſhall not be *rebaptized*, but they muſt preſently condemn all who do otherwiſe, for *Hereticks?* But you muſt be pardoned; you are proving a *Parity* between the *Council* of *Nice* and *Trent*, and you know you could not do that ſufficiently, unleſs they condemned all diſſenters in any *punctilio*, for *Hereticks*.

§. 14. P. 218. His Lordſhip further proves, *That* Trent *could be no indifferent Council to the Church, the Pope having made himſelf a ſtrong party in it; becauſe there were more Italian Biſhops there, than of all Chriſtendom beſides; yea more than double. For where the number of Prelates is expreſſed that had ſuffrage and vote in that Council, the Italians are ſet down to be a hundred eighty ſeven, and all the reſt make but eighty three, ſo that there were more Italian Biſhops by a hundred and four, than of all the reſt of Chriſtendom; ſure* (ſaith he) *the Pope did not mean to be over-reached in this Council. And whatſoever became of his Infallibility otherwiſe, he might this way be ſure to be Infallible in whatſoever he would have determined. And this without all doubt is all the Infallibility he hath.* P. 236. To this you anſwer, *That the Popes making a party, is diſproved by the very argument he brings to aſſert it*, viz. *the multitude of Italian Prelates; for, Who knows not, that the Italians are more divided in point of Intereſt and Dependence, than in any other Nation of Chriſtendom, by reaſon of the many Soveraign Principalities and States, into which* Italy *is divided?* But, What is this to the purpoſe, unleſs you could prove that the *Italian Prelates* were ſo divided in point of *Intereſt* and dependence? Since therefore they have all their dependence on the *Pope*, and not on thoſe *Principalities* in which they live; this evaſion, though very ſleight, is yet the beſt your cauſe would bear. And the greater you ſay, *the number of Biſhopricks* is in *Italy*, the more friends, I hope, the *Pope* muſt make by diſpoſing them; and, Could they do the *Pope* better ſervice, than to help him in this grand buſineſs at *Trent*, wherein they ſought to outvy each other by promoting the *Popes Intereſt?* But not only the *Proteſtants* complained of this, but the *Emperour* and other *Princes*, and all impartial men in *Germany*, *France*; nay, and in ſome parts of *Italy* too. But here his Lordſhip P. 220. encounters an Objection of *Bellarmine*, viz. *that in the Council of* Nice *there were as few Biſhops of the Weſt preſent, as were of the Eaſt at* Trent, and manifeſtly ſhews the great diſparity between the two *Councils*. 1. *Becauſe it is not a meer diſparity in number which he inſiſts on, but with it the Popes carriage, to be ſure of a major part; but neither the Greek Church in general, nor any Patriarch of the Eaſt, had any private intereſt to look to, in the Council at* Nice. 2. *It was not ſo much a diſparity between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops, but that there were ſo many more Italians and Biſhops obnoxious to the Popes Power, than of all* Germany, France, Spain, *and of all other parts of the Weſt beſides.* 3. *Even in the compariſon of thoſe two Councils, as to Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops, there is this remarkable difference, that Pope* Sylveſter *with* 275. *Biſhops confirmed the Council at* Nice, *but the Council at* Trent *was never confirmed by any Council of Eaſtern Biſhops.* To the two firſt of theſe you Anſwer with your beſt property,

property, *ſilence*. Only you would fain perſwade ſome ſilly people (if there be any ſo weak in the world that enquire into ſuch things) *That the Pope had no private intereſt at* Trent, *but what was common to him with other Biſhops*. You ſhould have done well to have commended the excellency of an *implicite Faith*, before you had uttered a thing ſo contrary to the ſenſe of the whole Chriſtian World. To the third you confeſs, *It is ſome diſparity, but nothing to the purpoſe, becauſe if the Pope himſelf had ratified them, the Council would have had as much authority as by that acceſſory Aſſembly.* The more to blame was the *Pope* a great deal, for putting ſo many *Biſhops* to ſo needleſs a trouble. But you ſay further, *This Council was not held juſt at the ſame time.* But *Binius* tells you, it was held aſſoon as might be, after the notice of what was done at *Nice*; ſhew us the like of the *Eaſtern Biſhops* at any time, and we will not quarrel with you, becauſe it was not at the ſame time: Though theſe Anſwers may paſs for want of better, they come not near your laſt, which is a prodigious one, the ſenſe of it being, *That the Doctrine of Faith defined by the Council of* Trent *was more univerſally received in the Church, than that of the Council of* Nice. *For that of* Trent, you ſay, *was univerſally received by the whole Catholick Church, and hath been more conſtantly held ever ſince; whereas many Provinces, either in whole or in part, deſerted the Faith defined at* Nice, *and embraced the* Arrian *Hereſie.* It ſeems then, the twelve good Articles of *Trent* have been more generally received by the *Catholick Church*, than the *eternal exiſtence of the Son of God*; and conſequently, that you are more bound to believe the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, or *Tranſubſtantiation*, than that the *Son is of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father*: For your grounds of *Faith* being reſolved into the *Churches Infallibility*, you cannot believe that which hath been ſo much queſtioned in the *Church*, ſo firmly as that which hath been univerſally believed and conſtantly held. But the univerſal reception of the *Doctrine* of the *Council* of *Trent* by the whole *Catholick Church*, is ſo intolerable a falſhood, that you would ſcarce have vented it, unleſs it were your deſign to write for the *Whetſtone*.

P. 237.

Tom. 1. *Conc.* P. 449.

Ibid.

To *A. C.*'s objection, *That neither French, nor Spaniſh, nor Schiſmatical Greeks did agree with the Proteſtants in thoſe points which were defined by the Council*, his Lordſhip anſwers, *That there can be no certainty, who did agree, and who not, (or who might have agreed before the Council ended) becauſe they were not admitted to a fair and free diſpute. And it may be too, ſome Decrees would have been more favourable to them, had not the care of the Popes Intereſt made them ſowrer.* Here you complain, *of his Lordſhips falling again to his Surmizes, of the Biſhops being over-awed by the Popes Authority in the Council*; which you call *an empty and injurious ſuſpicion, an unworthy accuſation, and arguing the want of Chriſtian charity.* But uſually when you ſtorm the moſt, you are the moſt guilty. For if you call this an *empty ſuſpicion*, &c. you charge many more with it beſides his Lordſhip, and thoſe, the greateſt of your own Communion; what meant elſe, the frequent *Proteſtations* of the *French* and *Spaniſh Ambaſſadours*, in which they often declared, that as things were managed, the *Council was not Free*? What meant thoſe words of the *Emperour Ferdinand*, in his Letters to the *Legats* and the *Pope*? *That the Liberty of the Council was impeached chiefly by three cauſes: one, becauſe every thing was firſt conſulted of at* Rome: *another, becauſe the Legats had aſſumed to themſelves only the liberty of propoſing, which ought to be common to all: the third, becauſe of the practices which ſome Prelats intereſted in the Greatneſs of the Court of* Rome *did make.* The *French Ambaſſadour*, *Monſieur de Lanſac* writ to the *King* his *Maſter*, *That the Pope*

P. 221.

Ibid. n. 8.

Hiſt. Council of *Trent*, *l.* 7. *p.* 683.

was

was ſo much Maſter of this Council, that his Penſioners whatſoever the Emperours or we do remonſtrate to them, will do but what they liſt. Several of the like nature might eaſily be produced, ſo that it is not his Lordſhip only is guilty of this *want of charity* (as you call it) but all impartial perſons, who were moſt acquainted with the *Affairs* of that *Council.* Whoſe judgement is certainly much more to be taken than ſuch who have ſworn to defend it. But you have an excellent Argument to prove the *Council Free, becauſe the Biſhops of the Council continued in the Faith and Doctrine of it as long as they lived.* And had they not good reaſon ſo to do, when they were ſworn before-hand to defend the *Pope*, and having ſecured him from danger of Reformation by the *Council*, and ſubſcribed the Decrees of it, they were as much bound to defend their own acts. And although it is well enough known what practices were uſed to bring off the *French* and *Spaniſh Biſhops*; yet when they were brought off, what a ſhame would it have been for them to have revolted from their own *Subſcriptions?* But what is this to that General freedom which was deſired by the *Roman Catholick Princes* for *Reformation* of the *Court of Rome*, and by *Proteſtants* both of the *Court* and *Church?* Was the *Council* any thing the more free, becauſe that party which met there continued in what they had done? Juſt, as if a part of a *Common-Council* ſhould ſuffer only ſuch perſons to come there whom they thought fit, and ſuffer nothing to be debated, but what two or three of the leading men ſhould propound, and yet this be call'd a free *Common-Council*, becauſe they who were of it, did after they had done, perſiſt in it? And this is all you have to plead for the *Freedom* of the *Council* of *Trent.*

§. 15. Touching the *Greek Church* and the writings of the *Patriarch Hieremias*, it is to little purpoſe, to ſay, *That they differ from us in ſeveral things*, unleſs you could prove, that they did agree with you in all. And if (as you ſay) *they do condemn Proteſtantiſm*, you cannot but know they do much more condemn *Popery*; and that in ſome of the main Articles of it. And therefore we have reaſon to believe, that you more dread a *Free Council*, wherein the *Greek Churches* may be admitted to equal votes with the *Latin*, than the *Proteſtants* do the judgement of the *Greek Church.* For it is ſufficiently known, how much the *Greeks* agree with us in the oppoſition to the great points of the *Popes Supremacy*, and the *Infallibility of the Church of* Rome; how far they are from the belief of *Purgatory* in your ſenſe, and ſeveral other things which are contained in the Decrees of the *Council* of *Trent*: If the *Patriarch Hieremias* did not in all thing agree with the *Lutheran Divines*, doth it thence follow, that he would ſubſcribe to the *Council* of *Trent?* But becauſe you pretend to give us a full account of the proceedings, between the *Patriarch Hieremias*, and the *Lutheran Divines*, we muſt a little further enquire into them. You tell us then, *That about the end*

P. 238. *of the laſt Century, ſome eminent Proteſtants of the Lutheran party, endeavoured to feel the pulſe of the Greek Church, to ſee if they could there find any Symptoms of their own diſeaſe. The deſign was* (you ſay) *to cloſe with the Greeks, for the better making out the pretended perpetual ſucceſſion of their Church; which Project they ſo hotly purſued, though formerly in vain attempted, that they would not deſiſt till the Patriarch being ſettled in his Throne, they had ſent him the ſum of their reformed belief, drawn up according to the Auguſtane Confeſſion. After a long entercourſe of letters, anſwers, and replies mutually continued for ſome years, and all Arguments uſed that might induce the Patriarch to receive them into his communion, he could not be courted to ſo much as the leaſt ſhew of approving their Doctrine: but did*

in

in all his Answers clearly confirm the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church, which those Lutherans endeavoured to overthrow. In so much, that the Patriarch tyred with their importunity, gave them a rebuke for their departure from the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, and desired them not to trouble him any more with their writings. A very formal story! One would expect the next news should have been, that the *Patriarch* had come to kiss his *Holiness's feet*, or at least subscribed to the *Council* of *Trent*. But all your stories out of the *East* have not so much *truth* as *formality* in them: witness one for all, that solemn *legation* from *Gabriel Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, to *Pope Clement* 8, wherein an acknowledgement was made of the *Popes Supremacy* as *Head of the Church*; upon which, such joy was conceived at *Rome*, that *Baronius* unmeasurably triumphs upon it, and sayes, it tends as much to the joy of *Catholicks*, as to the confusion of *Hereticks*: and therefore hath very solemnly published the *Legation* it self at the end of the sixth *Tome* of his *Annals*; but upon a further examination of it, it was all found to be a meer fiction and imposture of one *Barton*, as both *Thuanus* and *Thomas à Jesu* confess. But we must suppose no such danger in this story, for you tell us, *You have it from* Spondanus, *and he out of the writings of those Protestants themselves*: but I much rather believe by the circumstances of your story, that either you, or *Spondanus*, had it from *Socolovius* their virulent adversary, who having clancularly procured a *Copy* of the *Patriarchs* Answer, he publishes it in *Latin* with the title of *Censura Orientalis Ecclesiæ*, and gives much the same account as you do here. In which there are two grand mistakes, first, as to *the design*, which you say, *was to be admitted into Communion with the Greek Church*: The second, as to the *event* which you say was, *That the Patriarch did not shew the least approbation of their Doctrine, but did in all his Answers confirm the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church.* Both which, how notoriously false they are, will presently appear by a full account of the circumstances of this affair. We must know then, that the news of the *Lutherans* appearing in *Germany* against the *Pope* being spread at *Constantinople*, great enquiry was made what their doctrine was, and they were represented (by whose arts one may easily guess) as men holding strange opinions, denying the *Divinity of Christ*, &c. as appears by a letter lately published of a *Divine* about that time resident in *Constantinople*; and withall, that they were defamed generally as persons of *no Religion at all*, and of *wicked and flagitious lives*: upon this, those *German Divines* send by *Stephanus Gerlachius Chaplain* to the *Emperours Embassadour*, a *Greek copy* of the *Augustan Confession*, *Martinus Crusius* having before sent a letter only of respect to the *Patriarch Hieremias*; who by the means of *Cantacuzenus* was made *Patriarch* in the room of *Metrophanes*, who was then deposed. *Gerlachius*, as appears by a letter of his dated *May* 24. *A.* 1575. carries the copy of the *Augustan Confession* to the *Patriarch*, who then had his *Council* about him, which with great joy and delight, he saith, he read in the presence of them, and delivered it to be read to the *Priests* and *Calogeri*; but five points he selected out of it to be further discussed, and when afterwards he waited on the *Patriarch* to know his judgement concerning it, *Johannes Zygomalas*, who was then the *Rhetor Patriarchicus* a kind of *Chancellour* to him, told him, that having read it almost all over, they approved almost all, except that *about procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son*, and *unleavened bread*; but he particularly desired the *Patriarch* to return an Answer to the *Divines*, who sent it with his judgement upon it: and having spoken with the *Metropolitan* of *Nice* and others, they seemed very much pleased with that *Confession*. With the *Patriarchs* letter *Johannes Zygomalas*

Thuan. hist. l. 114. *ad A.* 1595.
Thom. à Jesu de Convers. omn. gent. l. 7. *c.* 6. *p.* 364.
Hottinger. Archaiolog. Orient. cap. 3. *p.* 69.

writes to *Martin Cruſius*, and therein tells him, that though in all things the *Patriarch* did not aſſent to them; yet it might be evident to all ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρωτεύουσι καὶ συνεκτικωτέροις τῆς πίστεως συμφωνοῦμεν, *that they did agree in the moſt important Articles of Chriſtian Faith; and that in other things they might eaſily agree, if they left the new and ſtrange cuſtoms and adhered to the Catholick Church with them*, and there was the greater hopes of it ἀδιστάκτων συμφωνούντων τῷ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης ἀρχιερεῖ, ὅτε τῇ καθ' αὐτὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἑκατέρων ἀντιφερομένων τοῖς κακοῖς ἔθεσι συνηθείαις καὶ παραχρήσεσιν, *Since neither part did agree with the Biſhop of old* Rome, *or the Church which joynes with him, but both oppoſe the evil cuſtomes and abuſes which come by him:* which bears the ſame date with the *Patriarchs* firſt Anſwer to the *Tubing Divines* May 15. 1576. And the *Patriarch* in his letter *heartily wiſhes an union and conjunction between them.* From hence we may eaſily gather, how true both thoſe things were, *viz. That the intent of their writing was, to be admitted into the communion of the Greek Church, and that the Patriarch did not in the leaſt approve their Doctrine, but confirmed the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church.* But we muſt look further into the Writings themſelves, to ſee how far they agreed, and wherein they differed. It appears then, that the *Patriarch* did profeſs his conſent with them in theſe things, beſides the Articles of the *Creed*, and the *ſatisfaction of Chriſt*, and other more general points, *viz. That the Sacrament was to be received in both kinds, that the uſe of marriage was not to be abſolutely forbidden the Clergy*, though their cuſtom is, that they muſt be married before they take Orders; beſides the grand Articles of the *Popes Supremacy*, and the *Roman Churches Infallibility*; Doth he that joyns with them in theſe things not in the leaſt approve their Doctrine, but confirm the *Tenets* of the *Roman Catholick Church?* But withall, it muſt be confeſſed, that beſides that common Article of the *Proceſſion of the Spirit*, wherein he diſputes moſt earneſtly; there are five others, in which they diſſented from each other, *about Free will, juſtification by Faith, the number of Sacraments, Invocation of Saints, and Monaſtick life*, and about theſe the remaining diſputes were. In ſome of which it is eaſie to diſcern how far the right ſtate of the queſtion was from being apprehended, which the *Lutheran Divines* perceiving ſent him a larger and fuller explication of their mind in a *body* of *Divinity* in *Greek*; but the *Patriarchs* troubles coming on, *Cantacuzenus* depoſing him too, and other buſineſſes taking him off upon his *reſtauration*, he breaks off the Conference between them. But although he differed from them in theſe things, yet he was far enough from rebuking them for departing from the *Roman Church*, although he was deſirous they ſhould have joyned with them in the approbation of ſuch things as were in *uſe* among themſelves. And in thoſe things in which he ſeems to plead for ſome practices in *uſe* in the *Roman Church*, yet there are many conſiderable circumſtances about them, wherein they differ from the *Church* of *Rome*, as hath been manifeſted by many others. As in the Article of *Invocation of Saints*, the *Patriarch* ſaith, *They do not properly Invocate Saints but God, for neither* Peter *nor* Paul *do hear us*, upon which ground it is impoſſible to maintain the *Romiſh Doctrine* of *Invocation* of *Saints*. And in moſt of the other, the main difference lies in the want of a true *State* of the *Queſtions* between them. But is this any ſuch great matter of admiration, that the *Patriarch* upon the firſt ſight of their *confeſſion* ſhould declare his diſſent from them in theſe things? It is well enough known, how much *Barbariſm* had crept into the Greek Church after their being ſubdued by the *Turks*, the means of *Inſtruction* being taken from them, and it being very rare at that time to have any *Sermons* at all, in ſo much, that one of their *Calogeri* being more learned than the reſt, and preaching there in *Lent*, was thereby under great ſuſpicion, and at laſt was

Apud Clytræ. de ſtatu Eccl. Orient. p. 122.

Primum Patriar. Reſp. p. 149.

was by the *Patriarch* himſelf ſent out of the way. It is therefore more to be wondered they ſhould preſerve ſo much of the Doctrine of Faith entire as they have done, than that any corrupt practices ſhould prevail amongſt them. The moſt then, which you can make of the judgement of the *Patriarch Hieremias*, is, that in ſome things he was oppoſite to the *Proteſtants*, as in others to the *Church* of *Rome*. But what would you have ſaid, if any *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* had declared his conſent ſo fully with the *Church* of *Rome*, as the *Patriarch Cyril* did afterwards with the *Proteſtants* ? who on that account ſuffered ſo much by the practices of the *Jeſuits*, of whom he complains in his Epiſtle to *Utenbogard*. And although a Faction was raiſed againſt him by *Parthenius* who ſucceeded him, yet another *Parthenius* ſucceeding him ſtood up in vindication of him. Since therefore ſuch different opinions have been among them about the preſent Controverſies of the Chriſtian world, and there being no declared Confeſſion of their *Faith* which is owned by the whole *Greek Church*, as to theſe things ; there can be no confident pronouncing what their judgement is, as to all our differences, till they have further declared themſelves.

Epiſt. Remonſt. p. 412.

PART III.

Of Particular Controverſies.

CHAP. I.

Of the Infallibility of General Councils.

How far this tends to the ending Controverſies. Two diſtinct Queſtions concerning the Infallibility, and Authority of General Councils. The firſt entred upon, with the ſtate of the Queſtion. That there can be no certainty of faith that General Councils are infallible; nor that the particular decrees of any of them are ſo: which are largely proved. Pighius *his Arguments againſt the Divine Inſtitution of General Councils. The places of Scripture conſidered, which are brought for the Churches infallibility, and that theſe cannot prove that General Councils are ſo;* Matth. 18. 20. Acts 15. 28. *particularly anſwered. The ſenſe of the Fathers in their high expreſſions of the decrees of Councils. No conſent of the Church as to their infallibility. The place of St.* Auſtin *about the amendment of former General Councils by latter, at large vindicated. No other places in S.* Auſtin *prove them infallible; but many to the contrary. General Councils cannot be infallible in the concluſion, if not in the uſe of the means. No ſuch infallibility, without as immediate a revelation as the Prophets and Apoſtles had: taking Infallibility not for an abſolute unerring power, but ſuch as comes by a promiſe of Divine Aſſiſtance preſerving from errour. No obligation to internal aſſent, but from immediate Divine Authority. Of the conſiſtency of Faith and reaſon in things propounded to be believed. The ſuitableneſs of the contrary Doctrine to the Romaniſts principles.*

§. 1. IF high pretences and large promiſes were the only things, which we ought to value any *Church* for, there were none comparable to the *Church* of *Rome*. For there can be nothing imagined amiſs in the *Chriſtian world*, but, if we believe the bills her *Factours* ſet up, ſhe hath an *Infallible cure* for it. If any enquire into the grounds of *Religion*, they tell us, that her teſtimony only can give them *Infallible Certainty*; if any are afraid of miſtaking in opinions, they have the only *Infallible Judge* of *Controverſies* to go to; if any complain of the rents and diviſions of the Chriſtian world, they have *Infalli-*

ble

ble Councils either to prevent or heal them. Who then would not run into the bosom of such a *Church* as this, with whom there is nothing but what is *Infallible?* Who but *Scepticks*, *Hereticks*, and *Schismaticks* would keep out of her communion? for what is there, men can desire more in a *Church* than she hath, where every thing is so *Infallible? Faith* is *Infallible*, *Tradition Infallible*, the *Church Infallible*, the *Pope Infallible*, *General Councils Infallible*, and what not? But who are there that more cheat and deceive the world, than those *Mountebanks*, who pretend to the most *Infallible cures?* For, what is wanting in *truth* and *reality* must be helped out with the greater *confidence*; and so we shall find it to be in these *Infallible pretenders*, who fall short in nothing more than where they lay the highest claim to *Infallibility*. Thus we have already manifested, that none have more weakened *Faith*, than such who have given out, that they only could make it *Infallibly certain*, none have brought more *errours* than that *Church* which arrogates to her self, that she is *Infallible*; it now remains, that we discover that nothing is further from promoting the *Churches peace*, than this present pretence of the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*. For the ending of *Controversies* was the occasion of this dispute; but this dispute it self hath caused more. And will do so, as long as men desire to see reason for what they do. For it cannot be expected, that men should yield their judgements up to the decrees of every such combination of men as shall call it self a *General Council*, unless it be evidently proved, that it is impossible they should err in those *decrees*. Where there be no other wayes found out for the ending some great *Controversies* of the *Church*, but by a free and *General Council*, all wise men will value the *Churches peace* so far as not to oppose the *determinations* of it; it being the highest *Court* of *Appeal* which the *Church* hath. But there is a great deal of difference between a submission for peace sake, in those things which are not contrary to the *Fundamentals* of *Faith*, and the assent of the mind to all the *Decrees* of such a *Council* as in themselves *Infallible*. For, supposing them subject to errour, yet if that errour be not such as doth over-weigh the *peace* of the *Church*, the *authority* of it may be so great as to bind men to a submission to them. But where they challenge an *internal assent* by vertue of such *decrees*, there must be first proved an *impossibility* of *erring* in them, before any can look on themselves as obliged to give it. And while men contend about this, that which was mainly aimed at, is lost by these contentions, which is the *Unity* and *Peace* of the *Church*. For it is a most fond and unreasonable thing, to suppose, there may not be as great divisions in the world, about the wayes to end *Controversies* as any other. Nay it is apparent, that the greatest *Controversies* this day in the Christian world are upon this Subject. It is not therefore any high challenge of *Infallibility* in any *Person* or *Council* which must put an end to *Controversies*; for nothing but *truth* and *reason* can ever do it, and the more men pretend to unreasonable wayes of deciding them, instead of ending *one* they beget *many*. For the higher the pretences are, the more all wise men are apt to suspect them, and to require the more clear and pregnant evidence for what they say; and if they fail in that, they have reason to question their *Integrity* much more than if they had contented themselves with more moderate claims. For it is not saying *Councils are Infallible*, will make men yield the sooner to their determinations, unless you first convince their reason by proving that they are so. But if you aim at nothing but the *Churches peace*, you might save your selves this labour; perswade men to be *meek* and *humble*, *sober* and *rational*, and I dare promise you the *Church* shall be more at quiet, than if you could prove all the *Councils* in the world to be *Infallible*. For, will that ever put a stop to the contentious *Spirits* of men? will that alter their tempers, or make them delight in those things which

which are contrary to them? No, you only offer to apply that *Phyſick* to the foreheads of men which ſhould be *taken inwards*; if you would endeavour to promote true *piety* and a *Chriſtian Spirit* in the world, that would tend more to the *Churches peace* than all your *conteſts* about the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*. But ſince you are reſolved to *contend*, the nature of my task requires me to follow you, which I ſhall more cheerfully do, becauſe, in pretence at leaſt, it is for *peace ſake*.

§. 2. This is then the firſt of thoſe particular Controverſies which this laſt part is deſigned for the handling of, and which in the conſequence of it, brings in many of thoſe particular *errours*, which we charge your *Church* with. In handling of which, I muſt (as I have hitherto done) confine my ſelf to thoſe *lines* you have drawn for me to direct my courſe by. Only in this firſt, to prevent that confuſion and tediouſneſs which your diſcourſe is ſubject to, I find it neceſſary to alter the method ſomewhat. For there being two diſtinct *Queſtions* treated of, *viz.* Whether *General Councils be Infallible?* and ſuppoſing them not *Infallible*, How far they are to be ſubmitted to? You have intermixed theſe two ſo together, that it will eaſily puzzle the Reader to ſee which of them it is you diſcourſe of. And although I muſt confeſs his Lordſhip hath gone before you in it, as his occaſion of entring into it required, yet now the points coming to be more fully examined, it will be the moſt natural and eaſie method to handle them apart, and to begin firſt with that of *Infallibility*; for the other ſuppoſing the denial of it, it ought to follow the reaſons which are given for that denial. But although I thus tranſpoſe your method, I aſſure you it is not with an intention to skip over any thing material, but I ſhall readily reſume the debate of it in its proper place. In your entrance into this diſpute, you give us very little hopes of any great advantage is like to come by it, becauſe, upon your principles, it is impoſſible we ſhould agree about the requiſites to a *General Council*; for his Lordſhip wiſhing *that a lawful General Council were called to end Controverſies*, P. 222. you preſently ſay, *A pure one to be ſure, if according to his wiſh.* Yes, too pure a great deal for you, to be willing to be tryed by. And when his Lordſhip profeſſes, *That any General Council ſhall ſatisfie him, that is lawfully called, continued, and ended according to the ſame courſe, and under the ſame conditions, which General Councils obſerved in the Primitive Church:* P. 240. You ſay, *It is too general to be Ingenuous*; you mean, ſuch a *Council* would be too *General* for your purpoſe; for, you are reſolved in your following words, *not to yield to ſuch a Council wherein all excommunicate Biſhops, Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are not excluded*; which is, in ſhort, to tell us, You are reſolved to account none *General Councils*, but ſuch as are wholly of your own party, in which the *Pope* ſhall ſit as *Judge*, Who are admitted, and Who not; though this be as contrary to ſenſe and reaſon, as it is to the practice of the *Primitive Church*, in thoſe *Councils* which were then called. In which I have already proved, that the *Pope* did not ſit as *Preſident*. And, as long as you hold to ſuch unreaſonable conditions, it evidently appears, That your diſcourſes of *General Councils*, are meerly *deluſory*; and, to uſe your own words, *Such a General Council as you would have, is a meer nothing* (as to a General and Free Council), *an empty name to amuſe ſilly people with*; for, you require ſuch conditions in order to it, as are deſtructive both to the freedom, and Being of a *General Council*. If therefore it be true, which you ſay, *That morally ſpeaking ſuch a General Council, as Proteſtants would have, is impoſſible to be had*; it is much more true, that ſuch a *General Council* as you would have, it is moſt unreaſonable we ſhould ſubmit to. For, as long as you condemn all other *Biſhops*, but P. 214. thoſe of your own *Church for out-laws, and deſertors of the Catholick Church*; and give no other reaſon for it, but becauſe you ſay ſo; we thereby ſee, How abſolutely

abſolutely averſe you are from any *Free Council*, and that without any ſhew of juſtice, you condemn all others but your ſelves, without ſuffering them to plead for themſelves in an *Indifferent Council*, where both parties may be equally heard. But it was wiſely ſaid of *Pope Clement* 7. that *General Councils are very dangerous, when the Popes Authority is called in Queſtion*; and this you know well enough; for, if a *Free Council* were held, the *Pope* himſelf might be found with his party to be the greateſt *out-laws and deſertors of the truly Catholick Church*. But in ſuch pack'd *Councils*, where the *Pope* ſits as *Preſident*, and orders all by his *Legats*, I ſhall deſire you once more to ruminate over your own words; *What Rebel would ever be found criminal, if he might be allowed to be his own Judge?* But of ſuch a kind of *Council* as you would have, I have ſpoken ſufficiently in the precedent chapter. That which we are now upon, is not the *Hypotheſis*, but the *Theſis*, in which we are to enquire, *Whether ſuch a General Council as you ſuppoſe, be Infallible or no?* His Lordſhip maintains the negative, and you the affirmative. Your Opinion then is, *That the Decrees of a General Council confirmed by the Pope, are Infallible, and that the holding of this, is a piece of Catholick Faith; and that it ſecures all the members of the Church, from erring in any matter of Faith.* For you ſay, *It is not* de fide, *that the Pope without a Council is Infallible; but, that Pope and Council together are Infallible*, you all along above aſſert to be ſo; and *that the Decrees of General Councils fall nothing ſhort in point of certainty of the Scripture it ſelf; and that the contrary opinion does actually expoſe and abandon all the adherents to it, to an unevitable wavering and uncertainty in Faith.* Theſe are your own words, in ſeveral places which I have laid together, the better to diſcern the *ſtate* of the *Queſtion*. The main thing then whereon the uſe of *General Councils* depends being, *that this muſt be believed to be* de fide, *in order to the certainty of mens Faith, and prevention of errours*; that I may the better ſhew, how inſignificant all this pretext of the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, is, I ſhall firſt prove from your own principles, that this cannot be *de fide*, and then examine the *grounds* you inſiſt on for the proof of their *Infallibility*.

§. 3. I begin with the *Firſt*, which will ſufficiently demonſtrate, to how little purpoſe you talk of this *Infallibility of Councils*, for preventing *uncertainty of Faith*, when you cannot have any *certainty of Faith* at all as to that principle which muſt prevent it. For, ſuppoſing that really *General Councils are Infallible*, if you cannot give me any reaſons to believe that they are ſo, their Decrees can have no power over my underſtanding, to oblige me to aſſent to them. And ſince you ſay, this principle muſt be held *de fide*, if there be no foundation at all for ſuch an *aſſent of Faith* to it, I muſt needs be *uncertain*, whatever the Decrees of thoſe *Councils* be upon your own principles. If you require an aſſent to the *Decrees* of *Councils* as *Infallible*, there muſt be an antecedent aſſent to this Propoſition, *That whatſoever Councils decree, is Infallible*: As I cannot aſſent to any thing as *Infallible*, which is contained in *Scripture*, unleſs I firſt aſſent to this, That the *Scripture it ſelf is Infallible*. If I therefore prove from your own principles, that none can have an aſſent of *Faith* to this Propoſition, *That whatever General Councils decree, is Infallible*, then all your diſcourſe comes to nothing, and men can have no more certainty by their Decrees, than if they were not Infallible. And this I ſhall prove by theſe things; 1. *That you can have no certainty of Faith* (I muſt uſe your own terms) *That the Decrees of General Councils in the general are Infallible.* 2. *That you can have no ſuch certainty as to the Decrees of any General Council in particular.*

1. *That you cannot in the general have any certainty of Faith as to the Infallibility of General Councils.* For, 1. What *Infallible Teſtimony* have you for this, without which, you ſay, No *certainty of Faith* is to be had? It is not

not enough for you to ſay, That the *Teſtimonies* of *Scripture* you produce, are an *Infallible Teſtimony* for it: for that were to make the *Scripture* the ſole *Judge* of this great *Controverſie*, which you deny to be the *ſole Judge* of any: And we muſt conſider this as a *preſent Controverſie*, which divides the *Church*, *Whether General Councils be Infallible or no*; In order to the ending which Controverſie, we deſire you to aſſign the way to it; for you tell us, you have the only *Infallible Way* of putting an end to *Controverſies*. Shew us therefore, which way this muſt be ended in the firſt place? Not by *Scripture*, for that were to come wholly over to us; and if it may decide this Controverſie, it may as well all others. Who muſt then? The *Pope*? That cannot be, for we are not bound to believe him *Infallible*, but only with a *General Council*, as you tell us often. Muſt every one judge it by his *reaſon*? No, this is the *private Spirit*, and would leave all to *uncertainties*. What then muſt do it? the *Pope* and *Council* together? But that is it we are enquiring for, Whether we are to believe *Pope* and *Council*, or no: And then the reaſon is, we muſt believe them, becauſe they ſay ſo. And, Can any thing be more ridiculous, than for you to deny that the *Scriptures* are to be believed for *themſelves*, and to aſſert, that the *Pope* and *Council* are to be believed for themſelves? If the *Pope* and *Council* then ſhould declare their Decrees *Infallible*, On what account are we bound to believe them to be ſo? You have found out then an excellent way for ending all other *Controverſies* that are ſo far to ſeek for ending this; which you cannot poſſibly do, without renouncing ſome of your principles, or an apparent contradiction. But beſides this, 2. Your very manner of aſſerting the Infallibility of *General Councils*, deſtroys all certainty of *Faith* concerning it. For, you ſay, That *Councils* are not *Infallible*, unleſs they *be confirmed by the Pope*: which, to the apprehenſion of any reaſonable man, is, *that they are not in and of themſelves Infallible*, but by vertue of the *Popes* confirmation. And therefore to ſay that *Councils* are *Infallible*, and then make that *Infallibility* depend upon the *Popes Confirmation*, is meerly deluſory: for, you may as well ſay, that the *Pope* and *Provincial Councils* are *Infallible*. For, Doth the Decree receive any *Infallibility* from the *Council*, or not? If it doth, then the Decree is *Infallible*, whether the *Pope* confirm it or no: If it doth not, then the *Infallibility* is wholly in the *Pope*: And he may as well make a *Provincial Council* Infallible, as a *General*. But, ſuppoſe it be ſome promiſe which helps the *Pope* in a *General Council*, which doth not in a leſſer (though there be no reaſon for that, for he is *Head* of the *Church* in one as well as in the other) yet you cannot have any *certainty of Faith*, that the *Council* is *Infallible*. For, you ſay, The *Popes* Confirmation is neceſſary to make it *Infallible*; but that the *Pope* may *infallibly confirm* the *Council* is no *matter of Faith*, and therefore the *Infallibility* of the *Council* can be none. For if the *Councils Infallibility* depend on the *Popes* Confirmation, you can have no greater certainty of the *Councils Infallibility*, than you have that the *Pope* will *infallibly confirm it*: But you can have no certainty of *Faith*, that the *Pope* will infallibly confirm the *Council*; therefore neither can you have any of the *Councils Infallibility*. The aſſumption depends upon this, that you acknowledge you can have no *certainty of Faith*, that the *Pope is Infallible*, but when he decrees in a *General Council*, *i. e. that the Decrees by Pope and Council, are Infallible*. But you can have no certainty, that the *Pope* in the Act of *confirming* them, is *Infallible*; for if ſo, you might aſſert it *de fide*, that the *Pope* without a *Council*, is Infallible. For his Act of *Confirmation* is diſtinct from that *Infallibility* which lyes in the *Decrees*, which have paſſed both *Pope* and *Council*. So that if the *Infallibility* of *Councils* lyes wholly in the *Popes*

Confirmation, and you can have no *certainty of Faith* of the *Popes Infallibility*, you can have no certainty of Faith of the *Infallibility of General Councils*.

§. 4. But, ſuppoſe we ſhould grant, that you might in *general* be certain of the *Infallibility of General Councils*, when we come to inſtance in any one of them, you can have no *certainty* of *Faith*, as to the *Infallibility* of the *Decrees* of it. For you can have no ſuch certainty, that this was a *lawful General Council*, that it *paſſed ſuch Decrees*, that *it proceeded lawfully* in paſſing them, and that *this is the certain meaning of them*; and yet all theſe are neceſſary in order to the believing thoſe Decrees to be Infallible, with ſuch a Faith as you call Divine.

1. *You can have no certainty of Faith, that this was a lawful General Council*; for that depends upon ſuch things which you cannot ſay are *de fide*, as, that the *Biſhops* in the *Council, are lawful Biſhops*, that the *Pope* who confirms them is *a lawful Pope*; for, by your own explication afterwards of your *Doctrine, concerning the intention of the Prieſt*, you ſay, it can be but *a moral certainty*, and that, you contend elſewhere, can be no ground for a *Divine Faith*. Beſides, you can have no more *certainty*, that is a *lawful Council*, whoſe *Decrees* you aſſent to, than you have, that thoſe *Biſhops* who are excluded, are *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks*; but, Can you be certain of that with *Divine Faith?* and, Whereon is that *Faith* built?

2. You can have no ſuch kind of *certainty*, of what *Decrees* were paſſed by them, and whether thoſe *Decrees* were at all confirmed by the *Pope* or no? For *Bellarmin* confeſſeth, *No other certainty can be had of that, than that whereby we believe there were ſuch perſons as* Cicero, *or* Julius Cæſar; *and condemns* Vega *for ſaying, The certainty of it depends upon the definitions of the Council it ſelf.* Now this at the beſt, being but a *humane* or *moral certainty*, you muſt contradict your ſelf, if you ſay, That a *Divine Faith* may be built upon it.

3. What certainty can you have, that may be a ground for Faith, that the *Council* hath *proceeded lawfully*; for, in caſe it doth not, your own Authors ſay, It may not be *Infallible:* For ſo *Bellarmin* anſwers in the caſe of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, *Concilium legitimum poſſe errare in his quæ non legitimè agit, that a lawful Council may err, in caſe it doth not proceed lawfully.* Now, Who can aſſure one, that there have been no *practices* at all uſed to bring off ſome men to give their *Votes* with them? It is hard to conceive ſuch a body of men, wherein ſome *few* do not ſway and govern all the reſt, and in that caſe, Can any one ſay, that it was the *Spirit* of *God* which *governed* the *Council?* Eſpecially if one *Preſide* in the *Council*, who hath authority and power above all the reſt, and that others in the *Council* have any dependence on him; Who can then expect that freedom which is requiſite to a *General Council?* The *Councils* of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*, are condemned; becauſe, though there were a very great number of *Biſhops*, yet ſome out-witted all the reſt, and, by their ſubtilty, brought them to ſubſcribe that confeſſion of Faith, which *Pope Liberius* afterwards confirmed by his own *ſubſcription*. And if ſo great a *Council* as this, muſt be *reprobated* on that account; Why not all others, where there are ſuſpicions of the ſame arts and ſubtilties? Nay, How can a man be ſure there have not been ſuch arts uſed in *Councils?* for it is not to be expected, that ſuch things ſhould be much known to the world, they being privately managed with the greateſt ſecrecy that may be. And yet it is in this caſe neceſſary to know, that the *Council* proceeded with all *ſimplicity* and *plainneſs*; for otherwiſe their *determinations* may not be *Infallible*. In order to which nothing is more requiſite than that there be no one, which hath any great *Authority* over them: For if the *ſecond Council* of *Epheſus*,

De Concil. l. 2. c. 7.

Epheſus, lawfully ſummoned, and the *Popes Legats* being preſent, be therefore rejected, becauſe *Dioſcorus* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* did *over-rule* the reſt; What aſſurance can we have of any fair dealing, where the *Pope* himſelf *preſides*, who hath more waies both to *terrifie* and *oblige*, than ever *Dioſcorus* could have? Beſides, ſet aſide this *over-awing* by ſome potent perſon, ſuppoſe ſome active and ſubtil men perceiving how things are like to go in a *Council*, uſe their wits to bring off ſome men, not of ſo deep reach as others, to their own *party*, and it may be by the *acceſſion* of a ſmall number, they *over-vote* the reſt; Muſt we preſently ſay, That the *Spirit* of *God* went off with thoſe few men to the other *party*? for the *Decrees* of *Councils* going by *Votes*, and thoſe *Votes* by the *major part*; Who doth not ſee, how eaſie it is (when it ſtands, it may be, upon a few Votes) to fetch off a number to the other ſide. And I do not know, where the *Spirit* of *God* hath promiſed, that where *three or four men* may ſo much alter the Decrees of a *General Council*, thoſe *Decrees*, if they paſs the *major part*, ſhall be *infallible*, and as *certain* as the *Scripture*. To be ſure then, there ought to be great *confidence* of the *ſimplicity* of the *Councils* proceedings where a man muſt *aſſent* to them as *Infallible*: and to that end men muſt be aſſured that they came thither without any *prejudice* upon their minds; that when they were there, they ſought nothing but the *Truth* and the *Honour* of *Chriſt*; or elſe, to be ſure, *they are not gathered in his name*, and if not ſo, they cannot expect *he ſhould be in the midſt of them*. Now let any one who underſtands the world, and humane nature, ſee if he can perſwade himſelf, that a *Council* can have no *prejudices* or *by-ends* upon them, that nothing of *intereſt* and *reputation*, may ſway upon them when they are met there, that there ſhall be no *heats* or *contentions* among them; for if there be, let him then ſee, Whether he can believe them to be *Infallible*? If you ſay, *In a matter ſo highly concerning the Church, the Spirit of God will not ſuffer them to err*: You muſt firſt ſhew, where the *Spirit* of *God* hath promiſed this; and then, if you could, that thoſe promiſes do not ſuppoſe the performance of ſome *conditions*, which if they neglect, they may want the effect of them. In which caſe, there can be no greater aſſurance of the *Spirit's preſence*, than there is of performance of the *conditions*, which is the thing I now aim at. Beſides all which, we have known, that when it hath been a matter of as great concernment to the *Church*, as any of thoſe you can fancy, great numbers of *Biſhops* at *Sirmium*, *Seleucia*, *Ariminum*, *Epheſus*, have miſcarried, and decreed that which hath been judged *Hereſie* by the *Church*.

4. Suppoſe men could be aſſured of the proceedings of the *Council*, yet what *certainty of Faith* can be had of the *meaning of thoſe decrees*? for we ſee they are as lyable to many *interpretations* as any other writings. If the *Scriptures* cannot put an end to Controverſies on that account, how can *General Councils* do it? when their *decrees* are as lyable to a *private ſenſe* and *wrong interpretation* as the *Scriptures* are: Nay much more, for we have many other places to compare, the help of *original tongues*, and the *conſent* of the *Primitive Church* to underſtand *Scriptures* by: when the *Decrees* of *Councils* are many times purpoſely framed in general terms, and with ambiguous expreſſions to give ſatisfaction to ſome diſſenting parties then in the *Council*. Who knows not, what diſputes have been raiſed about the ſenſe of ſome of the *Decrees* of the *Council* of *Trent*? about which the ſeveral parties neither are, nor are like to be, agreed. Nay, Who is ſo unacquainted with the proceedings of that *Council*, as not to underſtand how much care was taken in many of the *decrees* to paſs them in ſuch general terms, that each party might find their ſenſe in them. How fearful were they of declaring themſelves, for fear of diſobliging a parti-

cular party? and are theſe the effects of an *Infallible Spirit?* Since we know it hath been thus in ſome *Councils*, Who dares venture his *faith*, it hath not been ſo in others? Who dare be confident, this or that is the meaning of ſuch a *Decree*, when it may be capable of ſeveral ſenſes? Was it a ſign, that *Council* was *Infallible*, that was afraid to ſpeak out in a caſe of great conſequence and neceſſity in the *Church?* the *Council* of *Trent*, I mean, in determining, *That due honour be given to Images*, without aſſigning what that *due honour* was, which was the moſt needful of all to be done. If the *Decrees* of *Councils* were not *ambiguous*, what mean ſo many *diſputes* ſtill about them as are in the world? And when at laſt, you ſay, *That the Councils are Infallible when the Pope confirms them*, you ſay nothing more than if we ſhould ſay, *That Councils are Infallible when Scripture confirms them.* Nay, you ſay nothing near ſo much; for all are agreed, that *Scriptures are Infallible*, but many among your ſelves are far from believing, that the *Pope is Infallible.* And therefore we are much nearer ending Controverſies, in ſaying, *Councils confirmed by Scripture are Infallible*, than you are in ſaying, *Councils confirmed by the Pope are ſo.*

§. 5. Theſe things being thus in the *General* premiſed, we come now to the particular handling this Controverſie between his Lordſhip and you. And for the greater clearneſs of proceeding, he premiſes ſome things by way of conſideration; whereof the firſt is, *That all the power an Oecumenical*
P. 228. ſect. 33. *Council hath to determine, and all the aſſiſtance it hath, not to err in that determination, is all from the Univerſal Body of the Church, whoſe repreſentative it is. For the Government of the Church being not Monarchical, but as Chriſt is head, this principle is inviolable in nature; Every body collective, that repreſents, receives power and priviledges, from the body which is repreſented, elſe a repreſentation might have force without the thing it repreſents; which cannot be. So, there is no power in the Council, no aſſiſtance to it, but what is in and to the Church.* But withall his Lordſhip adds, *That the repreſentative body cannot be ſo free from error as the whole Church, becauſe in all ſuch aſſemblies many able and ſufficient men being left out, they which are preſent may miſs or miſapply that reaſon and ground upon which the determination is principally to reſt. By which means the repreſentative body may err, whereas the repreſented, by vertue of thoſe members which ſaw and knew the ground, may hold the principle inviolated.* All the Anſwer which you return to this, is,
P. 245. *That his ſuppoſition of the Churches not being Monarchical, is confuted already,* (and I ſay, whatever you have produced is Anſwered already) *and that the power and aſſiſtance of General Councils cannot poſſibly be communicated to them by the Church, but muſt proceed from the ſame fountain now, it did in the Apoſtles time*, viz. *the direction of the Holy Ghoſt; this ſpiritual power not being of humane, but divine Inſtitution; and not proceeding ſo much from the abilities of the perſons, as from the co-operation of the Holy Spirit with them.* To which I reply, that all this had need be more than thus barely aſſerted: it being confeſſed by your ſelves (as his Lordſhip ſhews) that a *General Council* is a *repreſentative* of the *whole Church*, you ought to have ſhewed us the *Divine Inſtitution* of this *Repreſentative*, and the promiſes made to it under that notion, or elſe we may ſtill ſay with his Lordſhip, That all the power and aſſiſtance it hath, is by vertue of that body which it repreſents. But I need not in this urge the Arguments of *Proteſtants* againſt you; for in this, as in moſt other Controverſies, we have enough from thoſe of your own party to oppoſe againſt theſe affirmations of yours.
Hierarch. Eccleſ. l. 6. c. 1. For *Albertus Pighius* not only aſſerts, but proves, that *General Councils are not of divine, but humane inſtitution, ariſing from a dictate of right reaſon; that matters of doubt may be better debated by many prudent and experienced perſons than by a few. So that as the ſupream authority for adminiſtration of*

affairs

affairs belongs to one, ſo it is moſt agreeable to right reaſon, that debates ſhould be by many. This he proves at large, that nothing but *humane reaſon* is the foundation of *Councils* in the *Church*; for, ſaith he, *In Scripturis Canonicis nullum de iis verbum eſt; nec ex Apoſtolorum inſtitutione, ſpeciale quicquam de illis accepit illa primitiva Chriſti Eccleſia. There is not a word of them in Scripture, neither did the primitive Church receive any particular order from the Apoſtles concerning them:* which he from thence proves, becauſe in all the time of the *primitive Church* till the *Nicene Council*, there is no mention at all of them. And at that time it did not receive any *new revelation* concerning the celebrating *General Councils*, but the *Emperor Conſtantines* zeal for the peace of the *Church* was the firſt cauſe and original of them. From whence he concludes that they have no ſupernatural or divine *Inſtitution, ſed prorſus humanam, but altogether humane:* for they are, ſaith he, *The invention of* Conſtantine *ſometimes uſeful, but not at all neceſſary.* This man ſpeaks intelligibly, and not like thoſe who jumble *Pope and Council* together to make ſomething *Infallible* between them. For he ſayes, *It is the better way by far to go immediately to the Apoſtolical See and conſult that, as the Infallible Oracle, in all doubts of Faith.* And very honeſtly tells us, *That he believes* Conſtantine *was ignorant of that priviledge of the Holy See, when he firſt inſtituted General Councils.* Than which nothing could be ſpoken truer. If you have then nothing more to ſay for the *Divine Inſtitution* of *General Councils*, than what you have acquainted us with, it would be much more wiſdom in you to contend with *Pighius* for the *Popes Infallibility*, and let that of *General Councils* ſhift for it ſelf.

His Lordſhips ſecond Conſideration you admit of, *viz. That though the Act which is hammered out by many together, muſt needs be perfecter, than that which is but the child of one mans ſufficiency; yet this cannot be Infallible, unleſs it be from ſome ſpecial aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.* Therefore omitting your very impertinent addition to this conſideration, *viz. So as to make its Decrees Infallible,* (which is the thing in queſtion): We proceed to the third; which is, *That the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt is without error, which* (*ſaith he*) *is no queſtion; and as little that a Council hath it. But the doubt that troubles, is, whether all aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt be afforded in ſuch a high manner, as to cauſe all the definitions of a Council in matters fundamental in the Faith, and in remote deductions from it, to be alike Infallible.* From this laſt expreſſion you would very ſubtilly infer contrary to his Lordſhips deſign, *That he granted General Councils to be Infallible in deductions, as well as fundamentals, but not to be alike Infallible:* whereas it is plain, his Lordſhip means no more by *alike Infallible*, than, Whether the aſſiſtance be *alike* in both to make them *Infallible*. And this you might eaſily perceive, but it would have prevented your cavil about *a graduated Infallibility*; which I know none aſſert but your ſelf. This Conſideration brings on the main of the battel, in thoſe *texts* of *Scripture*, which are moſt inſiſted on to prove the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, viz. *John* 16. 13. *I will ſend you the Spirit of Truth, and he ſhall lead you into all Truth.* John 14. 16. *This Spirit ſhall abide with you for ever.* Matth. 28. 20. *Behold I am with you to the end of the world.* Matth. 16. 18. *The founding of the Church upon the Rock againſt which the gates of Hell ſhall not prevail.* Luke 22. 32. *Chriſts prayer for St.* Peter, *that his Faith ſhould not fail.* Matth. 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, I will be in the midſt of them.* Acts 15. 28. *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us.* All which places (except the two laſt) have been already examined as far as concerns any promiſe of *Infallibility* in the queſtions concerning the *Churches* and the *Popes Infallibility:* and there being no reaſon at all given, why any *Infallibility* at all is promiſed by them to the *Church* after the

§. 6.

P. 230.

Ibid.

Apoſtles

Apoſtles times, it may ſeem wholly needleſs to beſtow a particular conſideration again upon all of them. For it is evident in thoſe places, all your drift and deſign, is only to prove a promiſe of *Infallibility* in the *Church*, and to the *Councils* only by vertue of that. But having at large before ſhewed, that no ſuch thing can be inferred from theſe or any other places, that which is built upon it, is wholly taken away too. For the only pretence that you have, why *Councils* ſhould be proved hence Infallible, is, becauſe the *Church* hath *Infallibility* promiſed by theſe texts, which muſt be very well proved, and much better than you have done, either here, or elſewhere, before the other can be deduced from hence. And yet ſuppoſing I ſhould grant, that *Infallibility* was promiſed to the *Church*, I ſee no ſuch neceſſary conſequence from thence, that *General Councils* muſt be *Infallible*: unleſs you can prove from *Scripture*, that the *Infallibility* of the *Church* is meant of the *Church repreſentative* and not *diffuſive*; which is a new task which you have not yet undertaken. For
P. 254. it is not enough to ſay, *That the body of the Church is bound to believe and profeſs the doctrine taught by the repreſentative, and therefore the repreſentative muſt be Infallible*, unleſs you could firſt prove, that there is a neceſſity of ſome continued Infallible teaching by the *Church repreſentative*: which I deſpair of ever ſeeing done. I am ſo far therefore from thinking as you do, *That theſe texts are ſufficiently clear in themſelves to prove the Infallibility of General Councils*, that I believe a *Philoſopher* might hear them repeated a hundred times over without ever imagining any ſuch thing as a *General Council*, much leſs concluding thence, that they are Infallible. But becauſe you again cavil with another expreſſion of his Lordſhips, in that
P. 246. he ſaith, *That no one of them doth infer, much leſs inforce Infallibility*; from whence you not *infer but inforce* this conſequence, *that he was loth to ſay all of them together did not*; I ſhall therefore give you his Lordſhips Anſwer from all of them together. Which is likewiſe ſufficient for every one
P. 239. of them. *And for all the places together, ſaith he, weigh them with indifferency, and either they ſpeak of the Church (including the Apoſtles) as all of them do; and then all grant the voice of the Church is Gods voice Divine and Infallible. Or elſe they are general, unlimited, and appliable to private aſſemblies as well as General Councils, which none grant to be Infallible, but ſome mad Enthuſiaſts. Or elſe they are limited, not ſimply to all truth, but all neceſſary to ſalvation; in which I ſhall eaſily grant a General Council cannot err, ſuffering it ſelf to be led by this Spirit of Truth in Scripture, and not taking upon it to lead both the Scripture and the Spirit. For, ſuppoſe theſe places or any other did promiſe aſſiſtance even to Infallibility, yet they granted it not to every General Council, but to the Catholick body of the Church it ſelf, and if it be in the whole Church principally, then is it in a General Council but by conſequent, as the Council repreſents the whole. And that which belongs to a thing by conſequent, doth not otherwiſe, nor longer, belong unto it, than it conſents and cleaves to that, upon which it is a conſequent. And therefore a General Council hath not this aſſiſtance, but as it keeps to the whole Church and Spouſe of Chriſt, whoſe it is to hear his Word and determine by it. And therefore if a General Council will go out of the Churches way, it may eaſily go without the Churches truth.* Which words of his, contain ſo full an Anſwer to all theſe places together, that till that be taken off there is no neceſſity at all to deſcend to the particular places, eſpecially thoſe which are acknowledged by your ſelves to ſpeak primarily of the *Churches Infallibility*.

§. 7. Yet for your ſatisfaction (more than any *intelligent Readers*) I ſhall add ſomewhat further, to ſhew the impertinency of the former places, and then conſider the force of the two laſt, which have not yet been handled.

1. *There*

1. *There can be nothing drawn from promiſes made to the diffuſive body, for the benefit of the repreſentative, unleſs the maker of thoſe promiſes did inſtitute that repreſentation.* Therefore, ſuppoſing that Infallibility were by theſe promiſes beſtowed upon the *Catholick Church*, yet you cannot thence infer that it belongs to a *General Council*, unleſs you prove that Chriſt did appoint a *General Council* to repreſent the *Church*, and in that *repreſentation to be Infallible*. For this *Infallibility* coming meerly by *promiſe*, it belongs only to thoſe to whom the *promiſe* is made, and in that capacity in which it is made to it. For, *Spiritual gifts* are not bequeathable to *Heirs*, nor can be made over to *Aſſigns*; if the *Church* be promiſed *Infallibility*, ſhe cannot paſs away the gift of it to her *Aſſigns* in a *General Council*, unleſs that power of devolution be contained in the *Original Grant*. For ſhe can give no more than is in her power to beſtow; but this *Infallibility* being out of her diſpoſal, the utmoſt that can be given to a *General Council* is a power to *oblige* the *Church* by the *acts* of it, which falls much ſhort of *Infallibility*. Beſides, this *repreſentation* of the *Church* by a *General Council* is a thing not ſo evident from whence it ſhould come, that from a *promiſe* made to one it muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of the other. For, as *Pighius* ſayes, *It cannot be demonſtrated from Theological grounds, that a General Council which is ſo far from being the whole Church, that it is not a thouſandth part of it, ſhould repreſent the whole Church. For either*, ſaith he, *it hath this from Chriſt or from the Church: but they cannot produce one tittle from Scripture, where Chriſt hath conveyed over the power and authority of the whole Church to a hundred or two hundred Biſhops. If they ſay, It is from the Church; there are two things to be ſhewed, firſt, that it is done; and ſecondly, that it is* de jure *or ought to be ſo done*, Firſt, it can never be ſhewed, that ſuch a thing ever was done by the *Univerſal Church*; for if it were, it muſt either be by ſome *formal act* of the *Church* or by a *tacit conſent*. It could not be by any *formal act* of the *Church*; For then there muſt be ſome ſuch act of the *Univerſal Church*, preceding the being of any *General Council*; for by that act they receive their Commiſſion to appear in behalf of the *Univerſal Church*. And this could not be done in a *General Council*, becauſe that is not pretended to be the *whole Church* but only to *repreſent it*: and therefore it muſt have this power to repreſent the *Church* by ſomething antecedent to its being. Elſe it would only arrogate this power to it ſelf without any act of the *Church* in order to it. Now that the *Univerſal Church* did ever agree in any ſuch act, is utterly impoſſible to be demonſtrated, either that it could be, or that it was. Yet ſuch a *delegation* to a *General Council* muſt be ſuppoſed in order to its *repreſentation* of the whole *Church*; and this *delegation* muſt not only be before the firſt *General Council*, but, for all that I can ſee, before every one. For how can the *Church* by its act in one age bind the *Church* in all ages ſucceeding to the *acts* of thoſe ſeveral *Councils* which ſhall be choſen afterwards? If it be ſaid, *That ſuch a formal act is not neceſſary, but the tacit conſent of the whole Church is ſufficient for it*: then ſuch a conſent of the *Church* muſt be made evident, by which, they did devolve over the power of the whole *Church* to ſuch a *repreſentative*. And all thoſe muſt conſent in that act whoſe power the *Council* pretends to have, and ſo it cannot be ſufficient to ſay, *That thoſe who chooſe Biſhops for the Council do it*; for then they could only *repreſent* thoſe who choſe them, and ſo their authority will fall much ſhort of that of the whole *Church*. But ſuppoſe ſuch a thing were done by the whole *Church*, of which no footſteps at all appear, we muſt further enquire by what *right* or *authority* this is done, for the authority of the *Church* being given it by *Chriſt*, it cannot be given from it ſelf without his *commiſſion* for doing it. Which if we ſtay till it can be produced in this caſe, we may ſtay long enough

Hierarch. Eccleſ. l. 6. c. 4.

enough before we ſee any ſuch *Infallible Repreſentative* of the *Univerſal Church*. The utmoſt then, that can be ſuppoſed in this caſe, is, that the parts of the *Church* may voluntarily conſent to accept of the *decrees* of ſuch a *Council*; and by that voluntary *act*, or by the *Supream authority* injoyning it, ſuch *decrees* may become obligatory. But what is this to an *Infallibility* in the *Council* becauſe it repreſents the whole *Church*? For neither is there evidence enough for ſuch a *repreſentation*, neither, if there were, could any priviledge of that nature belong to the *repreſentative body*, becauſe of any promiſe made to the *diffuſive body* of the *Church*.

§. 8. 2. *What belongs to the repreſentative body of the Church by vertue of a promiſe made to the diffuſive, can in no other ſenſe be underſtood of the repreſentative, than as it belongs to the diffuſive.* Becauſe no further right can be derived from any than they had themſelves. Therefore ſuppoſing a promiſe of *Infallibility* made to the *Church*, it is neceſſary to know in what way and manner that *promiſe* belongs to it; for in no other way and manner can it belong to the *Council* which repreſents it. If therefore the *Churches Infallibility* lyes only in *Fundamentals*, the *Councils* Infallibility can extend no further. If the *Churches Infallibility* doth not imply, that all the *Church* or the *major part* ſhould be Infallible, but that though the *major part* err, yet all the *Church* ſhall not, then neither can it be true of a *General Council*, that all, or the *major part* ſhould be *Infallible*, but only that there ſhould be no ſuch *General Council*, wherein all the *Biſhops* ſhould err. But then this is utterly deſtructive to the *Infallibility* of the Decrees of *General Councils*, for thoſe muſt paſs by the *major part* of the *Votes*: Which *Canus*, one of the acuteſt of our adverſaries, was ſenſible of, and grants, *that the major part in a General Council may err, and the leſſer part hold the truth; but then*, he ſaith, *That the Pope is not bound to follow the major part.* Which is expreſly to take away any pretext of *Infallibility* from the *Decrees* of the *Council*, and place it wholly in the *Pope*: And, Why may not then the *Pope* and a *Provincial Council* be as *Infallible*, as the *Pope* and the *leſſer part* of a *General Council*? What then do the *promiſes* of *Infallibility* to the *Council* ſignifie, if the *major part* may definitively err? And therefore *Bellarmin* likes not this Anſwer, as being too plain and open, but gives another as deſtructive to the *Councils* Infallibility, as this is. Which is, *that in caſe the major part doth reſiſt the better in a General Council, as in that of* Ariminum, *and the ſecond at* Epheſus, *yet that it cannot conquer it.* How ſo? Doth it not conquer it when the *Decrees* are paſſed by the *major part*? *No*, ſaith he, *for theſe Decrees are afterwards made void.* Very good: But then, I ſuppoſe in the *Council*, the *major part* did conquer, although not after. But by whom are they made void? *By him to whom it belongs to confirm his Brethren*, ſaith *Bellarmin*. Well, but the skill is, to know who that is in this caſe, who can reverſe the *Decree* of the *repreſentative body* of the *Church* under the plea of *confirming his Brethren*? If it be the *Pope*, Who reverſed the Decrees of the *Council* of *Sirmium*, to which the *Pope* ſubſcribed? And for that of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*, *Hilary* did more to reverſe it, than ever the *Pope* did. Therefore others ſay, It is in the *Churches* power to make void the *Decrees* of *General Councils*, as ſhe did the *Decrees* of the *Arrian Councils*. If ſo, then we plainly ſee, the *Infallibility* doth not lye in the *repreſentative*, but in the *diffuſive body* of the *Church* ſtill; if that hath the power to avoid and repeal the Decrees of *General Councils*. So that all the *Infallibility* of *Councils* is meerly *probationary*, and ſtands to the good liking and conſent of the *diffuſive body* of the *Church*. By which means the Decrees of a *Provincial Council* being accepted by the *Church*, are as *Infallible* as of a *General*. But in all theſe wayes, there is no proper *Infallibility* at all in the *major part* of a *General*

Canus loc. Theol. l. 5. c. 5.

Bellarm. de Concil. l. 2. c. 9.

a *General Council*, but it wholly lyes either in the *Pope*, or in the *diffusive body* of the *Church* ſtill.

3. *If theſe places which mention a promiſe of Infallibility to the Church, muſt imply the Infallibility of General Councils, as the Churches repreſentative, then it will thence follow, that the Decrees of General Councils are Infallible; whether the Pope confirm them or no.* For the *Infallibility* is not promiſed at all *mediante Papâ*, but *virtute Eccleſiæ*; for if they be *infallible* as repreſenting the *Church*, they are *Infallible*, whether there be any *Pope* or no: for the *Pope* doth not make them more repreſent the *Church* than they did before. And this is very well underſtood and proved by thoſe, who from theſe *promiſes* to the *Church*, and from that Infallibility conſequent upon it (by their adverſaries confeſſion) to a *General Council*, do inferr the *Councils* Authority to be above the *Popes*. Which is a juſt and neceſſary conſequence from this aſſertion, That the priviledges of the *Univerſal Church*, are by vertue of its *repreſentation* in a *General Council*. Which Doctrine was aſſerted by the *Councils* of *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, and by the *Sorbonne Doctors*, till their being *Jeſuited* of late. Who have therefore aſſerted, that it might be as lawful to call in queſtion the Decrees of the *Council* of *Trent*, as of thoſe *two Councils*. And whereas their adverſaries object, That this is not *de fide*: they anſwer, It is impoſſible but that it ſhould be *de fide*, ſince it is decreed by *General Councils*. For, ſay they, Were the *Fathers* at *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, acted by any other *Spirit*, than *thoſe* at *Nicæa*, and *Epheſus*? Why may not then the *Council* of *Trent* be oppoſed as well as them? For if there be any difference, they had much the advantage. In the *Council* of *Conſtance* (ſay they) two *Popes* were preſent, all the *Cardinals*, two *Patriarchs* of *Conſtantinople*, and *Antioch*, and the *Emperour* himſelf, and the *Legats* of all Chriſtian Princes; and beſides all this, it was confirmed by *Pope Martin*, and the *Acts* of *Confirmation* extant in the 45. *Seſſion*. And ſo the *Council* of *Baſil* was begun, according to the Decrees of the *Councils* of *Conſtance* and *Piſa*, and by vertue of the *Bulls* of *Martin* and *Eugenius*; and the *Popes Legats* were Preſidents in it. So that if *General Councils* be *Infallible*, it muſt be *de fide Catholicâ*, that their Authority is above the *Pope's*: And if ſo, their Infallibility cannot depend upon his Confirmation. Now, if we ſearch into the grounds on which they build this power of *General Councils* independently on the *Pope*, we ſhall find they derive it wholly from thoſe places of *Scripture*, which ſpeak ſo much concerning the *Church* and *Councils*, as is agreed on both ſides. And therefore *Æneas Sylvius* (afterwards *Pius* 2.) ſayes, *That is not the leſs* de fide, *becauſe it is contradicted by ſome, ſince it is founded on the promiſes of Chriſt concerning the Church.* Since therefore the *Pope* himſelf is but *Filius Eccleſiæ*, and the *Church* is *Sponſa Chriſti*; they ſay, It is unreaſonable that the *Son* of the *Church* ſhould not be ſubject to the *Spouſe* of *Chriſt*. If therefore theſe promiſes concerning the *Church*, inferr an *Infallibility* in it, and that *Infallibility* be in a *General Council*, as *repreſenting* the *Church*; it follows thence, that *Councils* muſt be in themſelves *Infallible*, whether *confirmed* by the *Pope* or no. And we may ſee, how little this Opinion of *Infallibility* of *General Councils* is like to ſtand between them, by the Anſwers which are given by thoſe of the other party, who make the *Popes* Confirmation neceſſary to the *Infallibility* of the *Council*. For *Canus* expreſly ſaith, *That the Council is ſaid to be Infallible in no other ſenſe than the Church is*, i. e. *in thoſe things wherein all agreed, and not the major part.* *Bellarmine* likes not this; *For*, ſaith he, *if the major part of the Council err, the Council muſt of neceſſity err; for that which properly belongs to the Council, is, Paſſing judgement in matter of Faith, or making Decrees: now, if that were not the lawful Decree of the Council, which is made by the major part, there never could be a lawful Decree, for none paſſes without*

Æneas Sylv. de geſt. Concil. Baſil. l. 1.

De Concil. l. 2. c. 11.

ſome diſſenting: and therefore he denies that the Council doth fully repreſent the Church without the Pope. So that on both ſides we ſee, how pregnant theſe proofs are for the *Councils Infallibility*, when one ſaith, That if they be underſtood of the *Church*, the *Councils Infallibility* doth not want the *Popes* Confirmation, the other to make the *Popes Confirmation* neceſſary, denies ſuch an abſolute *repreſentation* of the *Church* in the *Council*. If then the *Council* doth repreſent the *Church*, it is *Infallible*, although not *confirmed by the Pope*, if it doth not, then the *promiſes* made to the *Church* cannot belong to the *General Council*. Thus I have ſhewed you, how far theſe places concerning (as you ſay) the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, are, from proving the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*.

§. 9. But, though theſe general places concerning the *Church*, may not ſo clearly prove the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, yet, you ſay, *There are ſome particular places to this purpoſe. Which are*, Mat. 18. 20. *and* Act. 15. 28. Which not having been handled already, I muſt follow you more cloſely in the examination of them. The firſt place is, *Mat.* 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.* The ſubſtance of the argument from this place, his Lordſhip thus repeats from

P. 234. *Bellarmin. The ſtrength of the argument is not taken from theſe words alone, but as they are continued with the former, and that the argument is drawn* à minori ad majus, *from the leſs to the greater, thus. If two or three gathered in my name, do alwayes obtain that which they ask at Gods hands,* viz. *wiſdom and knowledge of thoſe things which are neceſſary for them: How much more ſhall all the Biſhops gathered together in Council, alwayes obtain wiſdom and knowledge, to judge thoſe things, which belong to the direction of the whole Church?* To which his Lordſhip anſwers, *That there is very little ſtrength in theſe words, either conſidered alone, being generally interpreted by the Fathers, of conſent in prayer, or with the argument* à minori ad majus, 1. *Becauſe, though that argument hold in natural or neceſſary things, yet not in voluntary or promiſed things, or things which depend upon their inſtitution.* 2. *Becauſe it follows not, but where, and ſo far as, the thing upon which the argument is founded, agrees to the leſs: Now this Infallibility doth not belong to the leſſer Congregation, and therefore cannot be inferred as to the greater.* 3. *Becauſe it depends upon conditions here ſuppoſed of being gathered together in the name of Chriſt, and therefore ſuppoſing Infallibility promiſed, theſe conditions here implyed muſt be known before ſuch a Congregation can be known to be Infallible.* 4. *Becauſe Chriſts promiſe of preſence in the midſt of them, is only to grant, what he ſhall find to be fit for them, not infallibly whatſoever they ſhall think fit to ask for themſelves.* 5. *Becauſe* Gregory de Valentiâ *and* Stapleton *confeſs, that this place doth not properly belong to prove an Infallible certainty of any ſentence in which more agree in the name of Chriſt, but to the efficacy of conſent for obtaining that which more ſhall pray for in the name of Chriſt, if at leaſt that be for their ſouls health. For elſe it would hence follow, that not only the definition of a General Council, but even of a Provincial; nay, of two or three Biſhops gathered together, is valid, and that without the Popes conſent.* The utmoſt I can make of your reply

P. 251, 252. to theſe Anſwers, lyes in this, *That you grant that primarily and directly our Saviour doth not intend that particular Infallibility, and this is that which* Gregory *and* Stapleton *aſſert; but only that he ſignified in general, that he would be preſent with his Church, and all faithful people gathered together in his name, ſo often, and ſo far, as their neceſſities required his preſence, they duly imploring it. But yet the argument holds for the Infallibility of General Councils, and not National or Provincial, becauſe the neceſſities of the Church require one, and not the other: and that it will follow* à minori ad majus, *in things promiſed, as well as natural, where the motive is increaſed, and neither goodneſs nor power wanting in the promiſer.* But all this depends on a falſe ſuppoſition, *viz.* that there is a

neceſſity

neceſſity of *Infallibility* to continue in the *Church*, and that all perſons are bound to believe the *Decrees* of the *Councils* to be the *Infallible Oracles* of truth: but we ſay, neither of theſe are neceſſary in the *Church*, and therefore you have no ground to extend this promiſe of *Chriſts* preſence to the *Infallibility of Councils*. For you are not to extend the *power* and *goodneſs* of Chriſt as far as you ſhall judge fitting, but as far only as he hath *promiſed* to extend it. For otherwiſe it would be far more for the peace and unity of the *Church*, if every particular Congregation had this Infallibility, than if only *General Councils* had it: Becauſe by that means, many diſputes about the *authority*, *calling*, and *proceedings* of *General Councils* would be prevented: Nay, it might be extended much further, for by this argument from the *goodneſs* and *power* of *Chriſt*, you might, for all that I can ſee, inferr with more force, that every true *Chriſtian* ſhould be *Infallible*, and ſo there be no need of any *Councils* at all. For, whatever argument you can produce, why *Chriſt's goodneſs* ſhould extend to make *Councils Infallible*, it will much more hold as to the other; for the peace, and unity of the *Church* would be far better ſecured this way. If you ſay that experience ſhews, *Chriſt never intended this by the errours of particular men in all ages:* To the ſame purpoſe we anſwer you as to *Councils*, that large experience ſhews, that when *Biſhops* have ſolemnly met in *Council*, they have been groſly deceived; as you confeſs in all the *Arrian Councils*. If your argument would have ever held from the *power* and *goodneſs* of *Chriſt*; Would it not have held at that time, when ſo great a matter of *Faith* was under debate? If *Chriſt* therefore ſuffered ſo many *Biſhops* ſo groſly to err, in a matter of ſuch importance, wherein the *Church* was ſo highly concerned, How can you inferr from his *power* and *goodneſs*, that he will never ſuffer *General Councils* to err? If you anſwer, *That theſe erred for not obſerving the conditions requiſite in order to Chriſts hearing them*, viz. *that they were not met in the name of Chriſt, did not come without prejudice, nor rely on Divine Aſſiſtance.* I pray take the ſame Anſwer as to all other *Councils*, that we cannot know that *Chriſt* hears them, or that they are Infallible, till we are aſſured of their performance of the *conditions* requiſite in order to that *Infallibility*. And when you can aſſure us, that ſuch a *Council* met together in the name of Chriſt, and came meerly with a deſire to find out *truth*, and relyed wholly on his aſſiſtance for it, we do not ſo much diſtruſt the *power* and *goodneſs* of *Chriſt*, as to think he will ſuffer them to be deceived. For we know upon thoſe *conditions* he will not ſuffer any good man to err, much leſs an *Aſſembly* of them met in a *General Council*. But here you have the hardeſt task of all lying upon you, which is, to prove that a *General Council* hath obſerved all theſe *conditions*, without which nothing can be inferred from this place, as to *Chriſts* being in any ſenſe *in the midſt of them*.

The laſt place mentioned for the Infallibility of *General Councils*, is that, Act. 15. 28. *Where the Apoſtles ſay of themſelves, and the Council held by them; It ſeems good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us. And*, ſaith his Lordſhip, *they might well ſay it. For they had infallibly the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, and kept cloſe to his direction. But there is a great deal of difference between them and ſucceeding Councils, who never arrogated this to their definitions, though they preſumed of the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt; and though that form might be uſed, yet they did not aſſume ſuch an Infallibility to themſelves, as the Apoſtles had. And therefore it is little leſs than blaſphemy in* Stapleton, *to ſay, That the Decrees of Councils are the very Oracles of the Holy Ghoſt. And, that all Councils are not ſo Infallible, as was this of the Apoſtles, nor the cauſes handled in them, as there they were, is manifeſt by the ingenuous confeſſion of* Ferus *to that purpoſe.* This is the ſubſtance of his Lordſhips Anſwer to this place. Which you think to take off by ſaying, *That there's no eſſential difference between the* §. 10. P. 237. P. 253.

certainty of the things determined by the Apoſtles, and thoſe decided by a General Council, confirmed by the Roman Biſhop: and though after Councils uſe not the ſame expreſſion in terms, yet they do it in effect, by enjoyning the belief of their deciſions under the pain of Anathema. If this be the meaning of the *Anathema's* of *Councils*, there had need indeed be no great difference between the *Apoſtles Decrees*, and theirs. But this had need be very well proved; and ſo it is by you: for you produce *ſeveral expreſſions of* Cyril, Athanaſius, Auſtin, Leo, Gregory, *and ſome others* (out of *Bellarmin*) *in which they magnifie the Decrees of General Councils, calling them a Divine Oracle, a Sentence inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, not to be retracted*, and ſome others to the ſame purpoſe, *by which you vindicate* Stapleton, *and tell us, he ſaid no more than the Fathers had done before him.* Yet all this is far from any vindication of *Stapleton*, or proving your aſſertion as to the equal certainty of the Decrees of *Councils*, and of the *Apoſtles*. For the ground of all thoſe expreſſions, and ſeveral others of the ſame nature, was not the ſuppoſition of any *inherent Infallibility* in the Decrees of *General Councils*, but their great aſſurance of the truth of that *Doctrine*, which was determined by thoſe firſt *General Councils*. For although I am far enough from believing the *Council* of *Trent* Infallible, yet if that had determined the ſame points of *Faith*, which were determined in the firſt *four General Councils*, and nothing elſe; I might have ſaid, *That the Decrees of that Council was a Holy and Divine Oracle, a Sentence inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, &c.* not that I thought the *Council* in the leaſt *Infallible*, in determining theſe things; but that they were of themſelves *Divine Truths*, which the *Council* determined. And in this ſenſe *Athanaſius* might well term the definition of the *Nicene-Council* againſt *Arius, the word of our Lord which endureth for ever*; and *Conſtantine* ſtile it a *cœleſtial mandate*; and *Gregory might reverence the four Councils, as the four Goſpels* (though *Bellarmin* tells you, that expreſſion muſt be taken in a qualified ſenſe) yet all theſe, and any other of a like nature, I ſay, import no more than that they were fully aſſured, the matters decreed by them, were revealed by *God* in his Word, and not that they believed that they became ſuch holy and divine Oracles, meerly by the *Councils definition*. For the contrary might be abundantly manifeſted by many expreſſions in them quite to another purpoſe: and if, inſtead of all the reſt, you will but read *Athanaſius* and *Hilary* concerning *Councils*, you will find your ſelf ſtrangely deceived, if you believed they ever thought them *Infallible*.

P. 254. What you add afterwards, *that it is ſufficient that there be a real Infallibility, though not like to that of the Apoſtles*, will not be ſufficient for me, till you can ſhew me the degrees of *Infallibility*; for, I will promiſe you, if you can once prove that *Councils are really Infallible*, I ſhall not ſtick to ſay, That they are *alike Infallible* with the *Apoſtles*. As for *your diſcarding* Ferus *as a prohibited Author*, it only ſhews the great integrity of the man, who ſpoke too much truth to be born by the tender *ears* of the *Roman Inquiſition*.

Before I had proceeded any further, I had thought (becauſe of a former

P. 245. promiſe) to have looked back to the place, where you *ſpeak* in vindication of the *decretal Epiſtles*; but becauſe you only referr to *Turrianus* his defence of them, I ſhall only return you an equal courteſie, and referr you to the abundantly ſufficient Anſwer to him by *David Blondel*. One would have thought you ſhould have been aſhamed of ſo notorious an impoſture as thoſe *decretal Epiſtles* are; but we ſee, what ſhifts a bad cauſe puts you upon, that ſuch men as *Ferus, Caſſander, Eraſmus*, are under an *Index Expurgatorius*, but the *decretal Epiſtles* muſt be ſtill juſtified; but he that doth not ſee the reaſons of theſe proceedings, wants a greater *Index Expurgatorius* for his *brains*, than ever they did for their *Books*.

We

§. 11. We return therefore to our preſent ſubject, and having manifeſted, how far the Infallibility of *General Councils* is from being grounded *on the veracity of Divine promiſes*, as you pretend without ground; we now proceed to the conſent of the *Church*, as to this ſubject: which his Lordſhip ſpeaks to in the next Conſideration. Which is, *That all agree that the Church in general can never err from the Faith neceſſary to ſalvation; but there is not the like conſent that General Councils cannot err.* P. 240. Whether *Waldenſis* aſſerting, that *General Councils may err*, ſpeak of ſuch *Councils* as are accounted *unlawful* or no, is not much material; ſince, as his Lordſhip ſayes, *The Fathers having to do with ſo many Hereticks, and ſo many of them oppoſing Church authority, did never in the condemnation of thoſe Hereticks utter this propoſition, That a General Council cannot err. And ſuppoſing that no General Council had erred in any matter of moment to this day, which will not be found true, yet this would not have followed, that it is therefore Infallible and cannot err.* And to ſhew that St. *Auguſtin* puts a manifeſt difference between the rules of *Scripture* and the *definitions* of men, he produceth that noted place in him, wherein he ſo fully aſſerts the prerogative of *Scripture* above all the writings of men or definitions of *Councils*: Which, becauſe it will be often referr'd to, I have cited at large in the Margin, but his Lordſhip gives the ſum of it in theſe words. *That whatſoever is found written in Scripture, may neither be doubted nor diſputed, whether it be true or right. But the letters of Biſhops may not only be diſputed, but corrected by Biſhops that are more learned and wiſe than they, or by National Councils; and National Councils, by Plenary or General. And even Plenary Councils themſelves may be amended, the former by the latter.* From whence he inferrs, *That it ſeems it was no news with St.* Auſtin, *that a General Council might err, and therefore be inferiour to the Scripture, which may neither be doubted nor diſputed, where it affirms. And if it be ſo with the definition of a Council too, where is then the Scriptures Prerogative?* But his Lordſhip adds, *That there is much ſhifting about this place, but it cannot be wraſtled off.* And therefore undertakes punctually to anſwer all the evaſions of *Stapleton* and *Bellarmin*, who have taken moſt pains about it. But before you come to particular anſwers, you are reſolved to make your way through them, by a more deſperate attempt: which is, to prove that it cannot be St. *Auſtins* meaning in this place, that *general Councils may err in their definitions of Faith, becauſe then St.* Auſtin *muſt contradict himſelf, becauſe he delivers the contrary in other places.* P. 255. This is indeed to the purpoſe, if you go through with your undertaking; but we muſt examine the places; The firſt is *l. 1. c. 7. de baptiſm. c. Donatiſt.* where you ſay, he expreſly teacheth, *that no doubt ought to be made of what is by full decree eſtabliſhed in a General Council.* But here a great doubt may juſtly be made, Whether ever you ſearched this place or no; for if you had, you would have had little heart to produce it to this purpoſe. For St. *Auguſtin* is there giving an account, why he would not inſiſt upon any *humane authorities*, but bring certain evidence out of *Scripture* for what he ſaid; and the reaſon he gives for it, is, becauſe in the former times of the *Church* before the *Schiſm* of *Donatus* brake forth, the *Biſhops* and *particular Councils* did differ from each other about the Queſtion in hand, *viz. rebaptizing Hereticks*, until that by a *General Council* of the *whole world*, that which was moſt ſoundly held *etiam remotis dubitationibus firmaretur*, *was confirmed the diſputes being taken away.* The utmoſt

Quis autem neſciat ſanctam Scripturam canonicam, tam veteris quam novi Teſtamenti certis ſuis terminis contineri, eamq; omnibus poſterioribus Epiſcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illâ omnino dubitari & diſceptari non poſſit, utrum verum, vel utrum rectum ſit, quicquid in ea ſcriptum eſſe conſtiterit? Epiſcoporum autem literas quæ poſt confirmatum Canonem vel ſcriptæ ſunt vel ſcribuntur, & per ſermonem forte ſapientiorem, cujuſlibet in eâ re peritioris, & per aliorum Epiſcoporum graviorem autoritatem, doctiorumq; prudentiam, & per Concilia licere reprehendi, ſi quid in eis forte à veritate deviatum eſt. Et ipſa Concilia quæ per ſingulas regiones vel provincias ſunt, plenariorum Conciliorum autoritati, quæ fiunt ex univerſo orbe Chriſtiano, ſine ullis ambagibus cedere, ipſaque plenaria ſæpe priora poſterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clauſum erat, & cognoſcitur quod latebat, ſine ullo typho ſacrilegæ ſuperbiæ, ſine ullâ inflatâ cervice arrogantiæ, ſine ullâ contentione lividæ invidiæ, cum ſanctâ humilitate, cum pace Catholicâ, cum charitate Chriſtianâ, Aug. l. 2. de bapt. c. Donatiſt. c. 3.

utmoſt that can be drawn hence, is, that when this Controverſie was decided by a *General Council*, the diſputes were ended among the *Catholick Biſhops*. But by what arts can you hence draw, that St. *Auſtin* thought the *Council Infallible* in its *definitions*? When the buſineſs came to be argued in a *free Council* by the diſſenting parties, and they more fully underſtood each other, and agreed upon one ſentence, St. *Auſtin* ſayes the former doubts were taken off: that is, the reaſons and *Scriptures* produced on the other ſide ſatisfied them: but he doth not ſay, that no doubt is to be made of what is by full Decree eſtabliſhed in a *General Council*; but, that no *doubts were made after it*. But if you ſay, *There could be no agreement unleſs the Councils definition were ſuppoſed Infallible*, you ſpeak that which is contrary to the ſenſe and experience of the world; and even of that general *Council* where this *decree* is ſuppoſed by *Bellarmine* to be made, *viz. the Council* of *Nice*. For, Will you ſay the *Council* was Infallible in deciding the time of *keeping Eaſter*, becauſe after that *Council* the *Aſian Biſhops* ſubmitted to the cuſtome of other *Churches*? Is there no way imaginable to convince men, but by *Infallibility*? If there be, their *doubts* may be taken away by a *General Council*, and yet that *Council* not be ſuppoſed *Infallible*. For if St. *Auguſtin* had meant ſo, nothing had been more pertinent than to have inſiſted on the decree of that *Council*; and yet he there leaves it, and calls all arguments of that nature *humane arguments*, and therefore ſaith, *ex Evangelio profero certa documenta; I bring certain evidences out of the Goſpel*. Which words doubtleſs he would never have ſo immediately ſubjoyned to his former concerning a *General Council*, if he had judged it *Infallible*, or its decrees as certain as the *Scripture*. In your ſecond place *l.* 7. *c.* 5. there is nothing hath any ſhadow of pertinency to your purpoſe; that which I ſuppoſe you may mean, is, *l.* 5. *c.* 17. where what he ſaid before *was decreed by a General Council*, he after ſaith, *was the judgement of the Holy Catholick Church*: from whence you may indeed infer that the *Catholick Church* did approve that *decree* of the *Council*, but how it proves it *Infallible* I cannot underſtand. Your laſt place is one ſufficiently known to be far enough from your purpoſe, *Ep.* 118. *ad Januar.* where he ſaith, *In caſe of indifferent rites, it is inſolent madneſs to oppoſe the whole Church*; but you are an excellent diſputant, who can hence infer, that therefore *General Councils are Infallible in their definitions in matters of Faith*. For any thing then you have brought to the contrary St. *Auſtin* is far enough from the leaſt danger of contradicting himſelf. But if you could prove that he were of your mind, that the definitions of *Councils* are Infallible as well as the *Scriptures*, never did any man more expreſly contradict himſelf than St. *Auguſtin* muſt do in a multitude of plain places, wherein he ſaith, *That no other writing is Infallible but the Scripture; That only according to them he judged freely of all other writings*; and that *becauſe he could yield an undoubted aſſent to none but them*. That *there is no other writing wherein humane infirmities are not diſcovered but in them*; that *men are at liberty to believe or not believe any thing beſides the Scripture*. Can any man, who ſayes theſe things, be reaſonably ſuppoſed to aſſert that the decrees of *General Councils are as certain as the Scripture is*? You ſee then what little advantage you have gained by this attempt of offering to make St. *Auſtin* contradict himſelf, if in this place he ſhould be ſuppoſed to aſſert that *General Councils* may err: which he doth plainly enough to any but thoſe who are reſolved not to underſtand him.

Aug. ep. 19. *ad Hieronymum c. Creſcon. Gramm. l.* 2. *c.* 31. *De Nat. & Gratiâ c.* 61. *c. Fauſtum, l.* 11. *c.* 5. *Epiſtol.* 112.

§. 12. This prejudice being therefore removed, we come to the particular evaſions of this place; which you thus ſum up, in order to the defence of

P. 256. them. *That when he ſaith, Former General Councils may be amended by the latter, it is only to be underſtood in matters of fact, in precepts pertaining to manners and diſcipline, or by way of more full and clear explication of what had been delivered by former Councils*. To both theſe, his Lordſhip offers very

very juſt exceptions. *To the firſt*, that it is to be *underſtood of precepts of manners and diſcipline*; he ſaith, 1. *That* Bellarmin *contradicts himſelf, becauſe he had ſaid before, that General Councils cannot err in precepts of manners: No*, (ſay you) *this is no contradiction, becauſe theſe depend much upon circumſtances of time, place, perſon*, &c. *which varying, it often ſo falls out, that what at firſt was prudently judged fit to be done, becomes afterwards unfitting, and in this caſe one General Council may be amended by another, and yet neither charged with errour.* But do you ſuppoſe the mean while that St. *Auſtin* ſpake pertinently to this buſineſs, or no? If he did, he can be underſtood only of ſuch a *precept* as that relating to the *baptiſm* of *Hereticks*. Suppoſe then one *Council* ſhould decree *Hereticks to be baptized*, and another afterwards correct this, and ſay, *They ſhould not*, Will you ſay that neither of theſe were in an errour? So that your Anſwer is wholly impertinent to the ſcope of St. *Auſtins* diſcourſe. And ſo his Lordſhip ſaith, *This whole Anſwer is concerning precepts of manners*: for St. *Auſtin diſputes againſt the errour of St.* Cyprian *followed by the Donatiſts, which was an errour in Faith; namely, that true Baptiſm could not be given by Hereticks and ſuch as were out of the Church.* But you ſay, *St.* Auſtin *doth not confine his diſcourſe to St.* Cyprians *caſe only, but by occaſion of his, and his Councils errour, he layes down general doctrine, touching the different authority of the writings of particular Biſhops, Provincial, National and General Councils.* Although I ſhould grant you this, it will make little for your purpoſe; for St. *Auſtins* main deſign is, to ſet the *Authority of Scripture* far above all theſe, and that in point of *Certainty* and *Infallibility*; and this being his main *ſcope*, whatſoever he ſayes of any of theſe, it is certain his purpoſe is to ſhew that all of them fall ſhort of the *Sacred Scripture*, as to our yielding aſſent to them. For theſe in the firſt place are ſet by themſelves, as only being *Infallible* and deſerving an *undoubted aſſent* to all that is contained in them: which being ſuppoſed, he proceeds to ſhew what the extent is of all other *authority* beſides this. For the *writings* of *Biſhops*, ſaith he, *they are ſo far from deſerving ſuch an aſſent as we give to the Scriptures, that they may be corrected by others, or by National Councils; and National Councils, by Plenary; and Plenary may be amended, the former by the latter.* In all which gradations two things muſt be repeated ἀπὸ κοινοῦ as running through the whole Diſcourſe, which are, 1. The difference of all theſe from the *Scripture* in regard of our *yielding aſſent* to them; for that is it, which he begins with, that we are not in the leaſt to doubt, whether any thing contained therein be true or no: and then comes the other in by way of immediate *Antitheſis*; but, the *writings of Biſhops*, &c. and although there be a *gradation* in all theſe, yet all of them are therein different from *Scripture*, that *whatſoever is found there may neither be doubted nor diſputed; but the writings of Biſhops may be doubted or diſputed of, becauſe they may be corrected by other Biſhops or Councils. And thoſe National Councils may be, becauſe they may be corrected by General; and even theſe General Councils cannot require ſuch an undoubted aſſent as the Scripture doth, becauſe the former may be amended by the latter.* So that if you take the ſcope of St. *Auſtin*'s diſcourſe in this place, whether he ſpeaks generally, or particularly, nothing can be more evident, than that he puts this difference between the *Scriptures*, and all other writings or *Councils*, that the one may not at all be doubted or diſputed of, but the other may: and the common reaſon of all is, becauſe none are ſo *Infallible*, but they may be corrected by ſomething beſides themſelves, which cannot be in any ſenſe ſaid of the *Scripture*. 2. Although Saint *Auſtin* adds that clauſe, *Si quid in eis forte à veritate deviatum eſt, If they have erred from the truth*, only where he ſpeaks of the writings of *Biſhops*; yet the ſeries of his diſcourſe implyes, that it ſhould be underſtood in what follows

P. 241.

P. 257.

lows too: that, as the writings of *Biſhops* may be corrected by *Councils, if they have erred*, ſo *National Councils* may be corrected by *General, if they have erred*; and ſo former *General Councils by latter* on the ſame *ſuppoſition* ſtill, *that they have erred*. For, as the *errours* was ſuppoſed to be the ground of *correction* in the former, it muſt be likewiſe of *amendment* here. And whatever is not ſo *perfect*, but that it may be *amended*, cannot be ſuppoſed *Infallible*; for, if the perſons had been *Infallible*, who had made thoſe Decrees in *General Councils*, they would have prevented any neceſſity of further *amendments* by *ſucceeding Councils*. So that, take *amendment* in what ſenſe you will, either for *ſupplying defects*, or *correcting errours*, it is deſtructive to your pretence, that the Decrees of *General Councils* are *Infallible*, and as certain as the *Scripture*. Which is ſo repugnant to the ſcope of this ſpeech of St. *Auſtin*, as nothing can be more. Your *Criticiſm* then, *from*
P. 258. *the ſignification of* emendare *from* menda, *and* menda *from* minus, *and ſo importing only the taking away any defect*, yields you no relief at all: for that *defect* which is ſuppoſed in General *Councils*, which needs that *emendation*, doth ſufficiently argue, there was no *Infallible Aſſiſtance* of the *Spirit* of *God* in the Decrees of thoſe *Councils*. For where *Gods Spirit* aſſiſts *infallibly*, it leaves no ſuch *defects* as are neceſſary to be *amended* afterwards, by ſome other *Council* which can pretend to no higher aſſiſtance than the other had before. But your critical judgement is not extraordinary, if you will have the ſignification of words taken from the conjectural *Etymologies* of them, ſuch as this of *Scaliger* is in the place where he corrects *Varro's Etymologies* (at the end of his *Conjectanea*) but, beſides that, all attempts of that nature are but *Conjectural Eſſayes*, it is but an ill way to judge of the uſe of a word by the *Etymology* of it; for, What multitudes of words are carried further in their ſenſe, than their *Originals* would bear? His Lordſhip therefore takes a far ſurer way to know S. *Auſtin's* meaning, than running to *Martinius* for the ſignification of the word *menda*; which is, by producing a parallel place in S. *Auſtin*, where it is taken for to *correct*, and
C. Fauſtum. l. 20. c. 21. ſuppoſes an evident fault; *aliud quod præcipere jubemur, aliud quod emendare præcipimur*; where *emendare* is, plainly to *amend* ſomething *amiſs*, not to *ſupply* ſomething *defective*. So that *Stapleton's* ſenſe of *amending* by *explication* of ſomething *not fully known*, and not by *correction* of ſomething *erroneous*, cannot here have place. For, as his Lordſhip well obſerves, the *National Council*, which S. *Auſtin* did in this diſpute ſpeak moſt of, was not guilty meerly of not fully explaining it ſelf, but of a *poſitive errour, viz.* that under S. *Cyprian*, determining that *Baptiſm of Hereticks was no Baptiſm*. And therefore when S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of *amendment*, it is ſuch an *amendment* as doth ſuppoſe *errour*, and not barely *defect*. And ſo the words uſed before of *reprehenſion* and *yielding*, do both imply more than a bare explanation; and thoſe which follow after, evince it fully, where St. *Auſtin* layes down the cautions, whereby ſuch *amendments* ſhould be made, *without ſacrilegious pride, or ſwelling arrogancy, without contention of envy, and in holy humility, in Catholick peace, in Chriſtian Charity*. All which words were very needleſs, if he meant only an *explanation* of ſomething not *fully declared* before; but are very neceſſary, ſuppoſing it to be the
Ibid. *amendment* of ſome former *errour*. All the Anſwer you have, is, *That theſe laſt words relate not in particular to General Councils* (by no means, although they follow them at the heels) *but to the other ſeveral ſubjects*, viz. *private Biſhops, Provincial and National Councils; which are ſubject to pride, arrogancy, and contention in their emendations*. But, Was not S. *Auſtin* an unhappy man then at expreſſing himſelf, that he muſt needs ſet thoſe Caveats after he had ſpoken of *General Councils*, which referr to the particulars that went before, without any reference to the immediate

antecedents?

antecedents? For if they do at all reſpect the proceedings of *General Councils*, (as doubtleſs they do, and that moſt immediately, as appears to any one who reads them) then they imply ſtill, that this *amendment* of *General Councils* muſt be done without *pride*, *arrogance* and *envy*, and with the *greateſt humility*, and *peace*, and *charity*; which it is hard to conceive why S. *Auſtin* ſhould add, unleſs he ſuppoſed ſome *errors* to be *amended* in them. Nothing remains further for the clearing this place, but only that his Lordſhip mentions that which he calls, *The pooreſt ſhift of all in* Bellarmin, *viz.* that he ſpeaks of *unlawful Councils*: and it is a ſign it is ſo indeed, when you have nothing more to ſay for it, *but only, that it was given* ex ſuperabundanti, *and with a Peradventure.* When his Lordſhip concludes, *that the Popes Confirmation to make Councils Infallible, is a meer trick, and unknown to the ancient Church*; you have nothing more to prove it to be grounded on the *practice of Councils* of the *Church*, and of *Reaſon*, but to refer the Reader back to what you have ſaid about the *Popes Supremacy*; and therefore I muſt do ſo too, for an Anſwer to what you have ſaid on that ſubject. P. 244.

The next thing which belongs to this Queſtion, is contained in his Lordſhips ſixth *Conſideration*; which is, *If the definition of a General Council be Infallible, then the Infallibility of it, is either in the concluſion, and in the means that prove it; or in the concluſion, not the means; or in the means, not the concluſion. But it is Infallible in none of theſe. Not in the firſt; for there are divers deliberations in General Councils, where the concluſion is Catholick, but the means by which they prove it, not Infallible. Not in the ſecond; for the concluſion muſt alwayes follow the nature of the premiſes, or principles out of which it is deduced; therefore if thoſe which the Council uſes, be ſometimes uncertain, the concluſion cannot be Infallible. Not in the third; for the concluſion cannot but be true and neceſſary, if the means be ſo.* Your Anſwer is, *That it is Infallible in the concluſion, that is, in the Doctrine defined, though it be not Infallible in the means, or arguments upon which it proceeded to the definition. And your reaſon is, becauſe one is neceſſary for the Government of the Church, but the other is not; for,* Deus non deficit in neceſſariis, nec redundat in ſuperfluis. You mean, it is neceſſary for you to aſſert it, whether it hath any foundation in reaſon or no: for you have not yet proved, that the *Infallibility* of *General Councils* is neceſſary for the *Churches Government*, and therefore cannot thence infer ſo great an abſurdity as this; that, where all the *premiſes* are fallible and uncertain, yet the *concluſion* may be prophetical and Infallible. But ſo involved and obſcure are your diſcourſes on this ſubject, that while you pretend a *General Council* is *ſeeing Viſions*, one might eaſily believe *you were dreaming dreams.* For, I pray, ſpeak out, and tell us, what you mean by *Councils being fallible in the uſe of means, and yet Infallible in the concluſion* drawn from thoſe *premiſes*, which ſhe was fallible in the deducing the concluſion from? For the deducing the concluſion, is in the *uſe of the means*; therefore how is it poſſible that the *Council* ſhould be *Infallible* in the *concluſion*, when it was fallible in making that *Concluſion?* But it may be I do not yet fully apprehend what you would have, neither I doubt do you. For you would fain be Infallible in the *concluſion* too, without ſo much as *truth* in the *premiſes*. But I ſhall attempt to make you ſpeak intelligibly; it muſt be one of theſe two things you mean, when you ſay, *Councils* are *Infallible* in the *concluſion*, either that they are *Infallible in deducing the Concluſion*, or *in aſſenting to the Concluſion.* If *Infallible* in the deducing the *Concluſion*, then it muſt be Infallible in the *uſe of the means*; for, unleſs it doth infallibly diſcern the *connexion* of the *premiſes*, it is impoſſible it ſhould be *Infallible* in drawing the *Concluſion* from them. So §. 13. P. 248. P. 263.

that it is *nonſenſe*, and a *contradiction* to ſay, That a *Council* is Infallible in the drawing a *Concluſion*, and not Infallible in the *uſe of the means:* for, it is to ſay, It is *Infallible*, and not *Infallible* at the ſame time, and about the ſame thing, and in the ſame manner. For, What is drawing a *Concluſion*, but a diſcerning that *truth* which reſults from the *connexion* of the premiſes together? for that which is concluded, hath all its *truth* depending upon the evidence of the *premiſes*, otherwiſe it is a *ſimple Propoſition*, and not a *Concluſion*. If you had then ſaid, That the *Spirit* of *God* did *immediately reveal* to the *Council* the truth of what was to be decreed; you had ſpoken that which might have been underſtood, though not believed; but this you durſt not ſay, for fear of the charge of *Enthuſiaſms*, and new *Revelations:* but when you ſay, The *Council* muſt *uſe means*, and make *Syllogiſms*, as other fallible creatures do, but then it is *Infallible* in the drawing the *Concluſion* from the *premiſes* (though it be fallible in the connexion of thoſe *premiſes*) is an unparallel'd piece of profound non-ſenſe. For, ſuppoſe the matter the *Council* was to determine, was the *Popes Infallibility*; in order to the proving this, you ſay, The *Council* muſt uſe all arguments tending to prove it; there comes in *Chriſt's Prayer for S.* Peter, *that his Faith ſhould not fail*, and that this muſt be extended to his *Succeſſors*, thence the argument is formed. *Whomſoever Chriſt prayed for, that his Fail ſhould not fail, is Infallible; but Chriſt prayed for the Pope, that his Faith ſhould not faith; therefore he is Infallible.* Now you ſay, The *Council* is *fallible* in the *uſe of the means* for this *Concluſion*, *i. e.* it may not infallibly believe the *truth* of the *major* or *minor Propoſition*, but yet it may *infallibly* deduce thence the *Concluſion*, though all the ſtrength of the *Concluſion* depends upon the truth of the *premiſes*. You muſt therefore either aſſert that the Decrees of *Councils* are immediately revealed as *Divine Oracles*, or elſe that they are *fallible Concluſions* drawn from *fallible premiſes*. And, were it not for a little ſhame, becauſe of your charging others with *immediate Revelations*, I doubt not but you would aſſert the former; which you muſt of neceſſity do, if you will maintain the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*: for if there be any infirmity in the uſe of the premiſes, it muſt of neceſſity be in the Concluſion too. But, ſuppoſe you mean *an Infallible Aſſent to the matter of the Concluſion*, though it be fallibly deduced, you are as far to ſeek as ever; for, Whereon muſt that *Aſſent* be grounded? It muſt be either upon the *truth* of the *premiſes*, or ſomething *immediately revealed*: If on the *truth* of the *premiſes*, the *Aſſent* can be no ſtronger than the grounds are on which it is built; if on ſomething revealed, it muſt needs be ſtill an *immediate Revelation*. But I forget my ſelf all this while, to urge you thus with abſurdities conſequent from reaſon; for, in anſwer to his Lordſhip, you grant, *That it is a thing altogether unknown in nature, and art too, that fallible principles can either as Father or Mother, beget or bring forth an Infallible Concluſion*; for, when his Lordſhip had objected this, you return him this Anſwer, *That this is a falſe ſuppoſition of the Biſhop, for the Concluſion is not ſo much the child of thoſe premiſes* (*i. e.* it is not the Concluſion) *as the fruit of the Holy Ghoſt, directing and guiding the Council, to produce an Infallible Concluſion, whatever the premiſes be* (true, or falſe, certain, or uncertain, all is a caſe.) *This is neceſſary for the peace and unity of the Church* (to believe Contradictions) *and therefore not to be denied, unleſs an impoſſibility be ſhewed therein.* (I doubt, believing contradictions is accounted no impoſſibility with you.) *But, I hope, no man will attaque Gods Omnipotency, and deprive him of the power of doing this.* Is it come to that at laſt? Whatever you aſſert that is repugnant to the common reaſon of mankind, and involves *contradictions* in it, that you call for *Gods Omnipotency* to help you in. Thus *Tranſubſtantia-*

Ibid.

tion

tion must be believed, because *God is Omnipotent*; and that men may believe any thing, though not grounded on *Scripture*, and *repugnant* to *Reason*, because *God is Omnipotent*. We acknowledge *God's Omnipotency*, as much as you, but we dare not put it to such servile uses, to make good any absurd imaginations of our brains. If you had said, It was possible for *God* to enlighten the minds of the *Bishops* in a *General Council*, either to discern infallibly the *truth* of the *premises*, or *immediately to reveal* the truth of the *Conclusion*, you had spoken intelligible falshoods. But to say, that *God* permits them to be fallible in the *use* of the *means*, and in drawing the *Conclusion* from them; but to be *Infallible* in the *Conclusion* it self, without any *immediate Revelation*, and then to challenge *Gods Omnipotency* for it: I know not whether it be a greater *dishonour* to *God*, or *reproach* to *humane understanding*. And if such *incongruities* as these are, do not discover that you are *miserably hampered*, as his Lordship saith, in this argument, I know not what will.

But we must proceed to discover more of them; two things his Lordship very rationally objects against *Stapletons* assertion, *That the Council is discursive in the use of the means, but prophetical in delivering the Conclusion.* §. 14. P. 249. 1. *That since this is not according to principles of nature and reason, there must be some supernatural Authority, which must deliver this truth* (*which*, saith he, *must be the Scripture.*) *For if you fly to immediate Revelations; the Enthusiasm must be yours. But the Scriptures which are brought, in the very exposition of all the Primitive Church, neither say it, nor enforce it. Therefore Scripture warrants not your prophecy in the Conclusion. Neither can the Tradition: Produce one Father, who sayes, This is an Universal Tradition of the Church, that her definitions in a General Council are prophetical, and by immediate Revelation: Produce any one Father that sayes it of his own authority, that he thinks so.* To all this you very gravely say nothing; and we can shrewdly guess at the reason of it. 2. His Lordship proves, *That it is a repugnancy to say, That the Council is prophetical in the Conclusion, and discursive in the use of the means; for no Prophet, in that which he delivered from God as Infallible truth, was ever discursive at all in the use of the means; Nay* (saith he) *make it but probable in the ordinary course of prophecy, and I hope you go no higher, nor will I offer at Gods absolute power* (but his Lordship was deceived in you, for you run to *Gods* Omnipotency) *that that which is discursive in the means, can be prophetical in the Conclusion, and you shall be my great* Apollo *for ever.* And this, he shews, *is contrary to what your own Authors deliver concerning the nature and kinds of prophecy, and that none of them were by discourse.* To this you answer, *That both* Stapleton *and you* P. 264. *deny that the Church is simply prophetical, either in the Premises or Conclusion, but rather the quite contrary; and that by the definition of the Councils being prophetical in an Analogical sense, no more is meant but that by vertue of divine assistance and direction, such a Conclusion or definition, in regard of precise verity, is as infallibly true and certain, as if it were a prophecy.* But if you had a mind that we should understand, or believe what you say, Why do not you come more out of the clouds, and shew us the difference between that which is *simply prophetical*, and that which is only *Analogically* so, but as infallibly true and certain as the other? But, that you may no longer blind the world with such insignificant discourses, I shall put you upon speaking more distinctly, by enquiring into those wayes, whereby *God* may be supposed supernaturally to work upon the minds of men, in order to the discovery of truth. These two wayes we may conceive that *God* may make known *truth* to the minds of men. 1. *By the immediate discovery of something, which could not otherwise be known but by immediate Revelation:* And of this nature were all those *future events* which were re-

vealed to the *Prophets*, and this I ſuppoſe you call *ſimply prophetical*; ſo likewiſe all thoſe *Doctrines* which are of pure *Revelation*, *i. e.* ſuch as could never have been known, unleſs God had revealed them: of which kind there are ſeveral in the Goſpel. 2. *God may diſcover ſuch things to the minds of men, which, though they might otherwiſe be known, yet not with that degree of certainty, as by this immediate aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit:* Now this I ſuppoſe, is that you call *Analogically prophetical*, which you aſſert *to differ nothing at all from prophecy, in regard of Infallible truth and certainty, being by vertue of divine aſſiſtance and direction.* And this you ſay a *General Council* hath, but not the former.

§. 15. Now to convince you of the abſurdity of your aſſertions, I ſhall ſhew you theſe two things. 1. *That this cannot be without an immediate Revelation.* 2. *That being ſo, it cannot be diſcurſive, as you ſay it is* in the uſe of the means. 1. *That this cannot be without an immediate Revelation:* for which I need nothing but your own aſſertions, *viz.* that this is a higher diſcovery of truth, than *nature* can ever attain to, or ordinary *Grace*; and that it is ſuch as obliges all men *to an internal aſſent to it*, when it is declared. Now I ſhall deſire you, or any of your party, to tell me, What difference there is between this, and the *Inſpiration* which the *Apoſtles* had in writing the *Books* of *Scripture*. I mean not ſuch as contain *prophecies* in them, but thoſe which deliver to us the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*: as for *inſtance*, in S. *John's Goſpel*, he doth not pretend to deliver any thing which was not revealed before, but to give an account of the *Doctrine* and life of *Chriſt*. And ſo that *Inſpiration* was not *ſimply prophetical*, as in writing the *Prophecies* in the *Apocalypſe*, but *Analogically* ſo, in that ſuch an aſſiſtance of *Gods Spirit*, as made what he writ, to be as infallibly true and certain, as if it were a *Prophecy*, which are your own words concerning the *Infallibility* of *Councils*. Shew us therefore any rational difference between this kind of *Infallibility*, and that *Inſpiration* by which the *Books* of *Scripture* are written. If you ſay, the one was *immediate* and the other not, you beg the Queſtion: for I am proving that what you aſſert, doth neceſſarily imply, that it is as *immediate* as that which the *Apoſtles* had. Nay I will go yet further, and ſay it is as immediate as that which the *Apoſtles* themſelves had in *Council*. For when they ſaid, *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to us*, Can any thing more poſſibly be underſtood, than that the *Spirit* of *God* did ſo far aſſiſt their minds, that they ſhould not err in their Definitions? And therefore when of late you are grown (forſooth) ſomewhat jealous of the word *Infallibility*, and you give us a grave advertiſement at the end of your *Preface*, *that you do not mean by it an intrinſecal unerring power in all things, in thoſe whom you account Infallible, but only that they never have erred, nor ſhall err in definitions of Faith*; you do not at all advantage your ſelves by it. For none of your conſiderate adverſaries do charge you ſo much with uſurping *Gods incommunicable attribute of Infallibility*, (which is thereby avoided becauſe you pretend to derive it from him) but that you challenge the ſame *Infallibility* which the *Apoſtles* had. And ſo muſt of neceſſity aſſert as much of *Divine Enthuſiaſm* and *immediate revelation* in your *Church*, as any of the *Apoſtles* themſelves had. For what ever they had, came *by vertue of Chriſts promiſe*, and that is all you ſay for the *Churches Infallibility*: but that doth no more take it off from being an *immediate revelation* in the *Church*, than it did in the Apoſtles. If you ſay, *The Church is only ſecured that it neither hath erred, nor can err in definitions of Faith*, What more had the *Apoſtles* than this? And if this in them did require an *immediate inſpiration*, certainly it muſt do ſo in the *Church* too. But you ſay, *Neither Church nor Council do publiſh immediate revelations, nor create any new Articles of Faith, but only declare and unfold by their definitions, that doctrine, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles*

Ibid.

ſtles in ſome manner firſt delivered. But all this, ſuppoſing it true, doth not hinder, but the *Councils Infallibility* muſt imply an *immediate revelation* on the *part* of the *Council*, though not of the *Doctrine* decreed by them. For granting the *decrees* of the *Council* are no *new Articles of Faith* (which is yet contrary to your own principles; for if by the definitions of *Councils* that may be *de fide* which was not before, then the *Councils* do make *new Articles of Faith*, though not *new Doctrines*) *i. e.* that the *matter of them in ſome manner was before revealed*, yet ſince you ſay *the Council in declaring them, hath an Infallibility, equal to Prophecy*, it muſt be by *immediate inſpiration.* For, Hath the *Council* greater certainty, and higher aſſiſtance than any ordinary believer hath or not? if not, it can be no more *Infallible* than an ordinary believer; if it hath, it muſt be *immediate*, becauſe it hath a higher degree of certainty, than can be attained by the *uſe of means.* And to ſay this, as you do expreſly, when you aſſert the *Council* fallible in the *uſe of means*, but infallible in the *concluſion*, is a moſt palpable Contradiction. For, it is to aſſert a *certainty* beyond and above the *uſe of means*, and yet not *immediate.* But here lyes your perpetual miſtake, as though nothing could be an *immediate revelation*, but what is a *revelation* of ſome *Doctrine never revealed before:* whereas if there be a further explanation of that Doctrine in as *Infallible* a manner as the *Apoſtles* at firſt revealed it, that *explanation* is by as immediate a *revelation*, as the firſt diſcovery of it. As is clear in the *Council* of the *Apoſtles*, for I hope you will not deny, but the non-obligation of the ceremonial *Law* was *in ſome manner revealed to them before*; and yet I hope you will not ſay, but the *Apoſtles* had an *immediate revelation* as to what they decreed in that *Council.* It is very plain therefore, that when you ſay, *General Councils neither have erred nor can err in their definitions*, they uſurp as great a priviledge thereby as ever the *Apoſtles* had, and in order to it muſt have as *immediate* an *inſpiration.* For, never was there any ſuch *Infallibility*, either in the *Prophets* or *Apoſtles*, as did ſuppoſe an *abſolute impoſſibility of error*; but it was wholly *hypothetical* in caſe of *Divine aſſiſtance*, which hindred them from any capacity of erring ſo long as that continued with them and no longer. For, *inſpiration* was no *permanent habit*, but a *tranſient act* in them; and that being removed, they were lyable to errors as well as others; from whence it follows, that where *revelations* were moſt *immediate*, they did no more than what you aſſume to your *Church*, viz. *preſerve them from actual error in declaring Gods will.* So that nothing can be more evident than that you challenge as great an *Infallibility*, and as *immediate aſſiſtance* of *Gods Spirit* in *Councils* as ever the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* had. And therefore that *Divine* was in the right, of whom *Canus* ſpeaks, who aſſerted, *That ſince General Councils were Infallible, their definitions ought to be equalled with the Scriptures themſelves.* And although *Canus* and others diſlike this, it is rather becauſe of the *odium* which would follow it, than for any juſt *reaſon* they give, why it ſhould not follow. For they not only ſuppoſe as great a *Certainty* or *Infallibility* in the *Decrees* of both, but an equal *obligation* to *internal aſſent* in thoſe to whom they are declared. Which doth further prove, that the *revelation* muſt be *immediate:* for if by vertue of thoſe *definitions*, we are obliged to *aſſent* to the Doctrines contained in them as Infallibly true, there muſt be an *immediate Divine Authority* which muſt command our *Aſſent.* For nothing ſhort of that can oblige us to believe any thing as of *Divine Revelation*; now *Councils* require, that we muſt believe their *definitions* to be *Divine truths*, though men were not *obliged* to believe them to be ſo, before thoſe *definitions.* For that is your expreſs Doctrine, *That though the matters decreed in Councils were in ſome manner revealed before, yet not ſo as to oblige all men with an explicite*

Canus l. 5. c. 5

explicite aſſent to believe them; but after the definitions of *Councils* they are bound to do it. So that though there be not an *object* newly *revealed*, yet there ariſeth a *new obligation* to *internal aſſent*; which *obligation* cannot come but from *immediate Divine Authority*. If you ſay, *The obligation comes not ſimply by vertue of the Councils definitions, but by a command extant in Scripture, whereby all are bound to give this aſſent to the decrees of Councils*; I then ſay, we muſt be excuſed from it, till you have diſcharged this *new obligation* upon your ſelf, by producing ſome expreſs teſtimony of *Scripture* to that purpoſe: which is, I think, ſufficient to keep our minds at liberty from this *internal aſſent* to the definitions of *General Councils* by vertue of any *Infallibility* in them. And thus having more at large conſidered the nature of this *Infallibility* which you challenge to *General Councils*, and having ſhewed that it implyes as *immediate a revelation* as the *Apoſtles* had; the ſecond thing is ſufficiently demonſtrated, *That this Infallibility cannot ſuppoſe diſcurſiveneſs with fallibility in the uſe of the means*, becauſe theſe two are repugnant to each other.

§. 16. The next thing to be conſidered, is, *Stapletons argument, why Councils muſt be Prophetical in the concluſion; becauſe that which is determined by the Church is matter of Faith, and not of knowledge, and the aſſent required elſe would not be an aſſent of Faith, but an habit of knowledge.* To which his
P. 251. Lordſhip Anſwers, *That he ſees no inconvenience in it, if it be granted; for one and the ſame concluſion may be Faith to the believer, that cannot prove; and knowledge to the learned, that can.* Which he further explains thus: *Some ſupernatural principles which reaſon cannot demonſtrate ſimply, muſt be ſuppoſed in order to Faith; but theſe principles being owned, reaſon being thereby inlightned, that may ſerve to convert or convince Philoſophers, and the great men of reaſon in the very point of Faith where it is at the higheſt.* This he brings down *to the buſineſs of Councils; as to which*, he ſaith, *that the firſt immediate, fundamental points of Faith, as they cannot be proved ſimply by reaſon, ſo neither need they be determined by any Council, nor ever were they attempted, they are ſo plain ſet down in Scripture. If about the ſenſe and true meaning of theſe, or neceſſary deduction out of the prime Articles of Faith, General Councils determine any thing, as they have done at* Nice *and the reſt; there is no inconvenience, that one and the ſame Canon of the Council ſhould be believed as it reflects upon the Articles and grounds indemonſtrable; and yet known to the learned, by the means and proof, by which that deduction is vouched and made good. And again the concluſion of a Council, ſuppoſe that in* Nice *about the conſubſtantiality of Chriſt with the Father, in it ſelf conſidered, is indemonſtrable by reaſon; there* (ſaith he) *I believe, and aſſent in Faith: but the ſame concluſion if you give me the ground of Scripture and the Creed* (*for ſomewhat muſt be ſuppoſed in all whether Faith or knowledge*) *is demonſtrable by natural reaſon againſt any Arrian in the world.* So that he concludes, *The weaker ſort of Chriſtians may aſſent by Faith, where the more learned may build it on reaſon, the principles of Faith being ſuppoſed.* This is the ſubſtance of his Lordſhips Diſcourſe. In Anſwer to which,
P. 255. you tell us, *That the Biſhop ſeems to broach a new Doctrine, that the aſſent of Faith may be an habit of knowledge. But ſurely* (ſay you) *Divine Faith is according to the Apoſtle*, Heb. 11. *an Argument of things which do not appear*, viz. *by the ſame means, by which we give this aſſent of Faith: otherwiſe our Faith would not be free and meritorious.* An Anſwer I muſt needs ſay, hugely ſuitable to your principles, who are moſt concerned of all men to ſet *reaſon* at a diſtance from Faith; and ſo you do ſufficiently in this Diſcourſe of it. For it is no eaſie matter to underſtand what you mean, but that is not to be wondred at, ſince you make *obſcurity* ſo neceſſary to *Faith*. *Divine Faith is* (you ſay) *an Argument of things which do not appear*, viz.

viz. *by the ſame means, by which we give this aſſent of Faith.* Do you mean that the *objects* of *Faith do not appear?* or that the *reaſon* of *believing* doth not? If only the former, which is all the *Apoſtle* means; that is nothing to your purpoſe, for we are not enquiring, whether men may not believe *the things which are not ſeen*, but, whether the *aſſent* of *Faith* may not be *conſiſtent* with *reaſon:* which I am ſo far from thinking any ſtrange doctrine, that I cannot ſee how there can be an *aſſent* of *Faith* without *reaſon.* And they muſt be ſuch great *meriters at Gods hands*, as you are, who muſt think to oblige him with believing what you cannot underſtand, or ſee any ground in reaſon for. For, *aſſent* being an *act* of the *mind* cannot be elicited without ſufficient reaſon perſwading the mind to it; or elſe, it is *ſo far from being free*, and as you (who are ſo loth to be beholding to *God*) call it, *meritorious*, that it is bruitiſh and irrational. Not that there are *demonſtrations* to be expected for every thing we *believe*, but there muſt be ſufficient *reaſon* for the *mind* to build its *aſſent* upon, and that *reaſon* is *evidence*, and that *evidence* deſtroys that *obſcurity* which you make neceſſary to Faith. *Evidence*, I ſay, not of the *object*, but of the *reaſon* and *obligation* to *aſſent*. When you ſay, *That Faith, as Faith, cannot be Knowledge*, his Lordſhip grants it; but yet it doth not thence follow, that what may be believed by one may not be known by another: and *though Chriſt* (as you add) *did not ſet up a School of knowledge but of Faith*, yet he did not ſet up a *School of blind implicite Faith*, but ſuch a one as conſiſts of a rational and diſcurſive act of the mind. You muſt not therefore expect that we ſhould believe the definitions of *Councils* becauſe they pretend to be *Infallible*, but you muſt firſt convince our *reaſons* that they are ſo, and then we ſhall aſſent to them. But you have very well contrived your buſineſs, to have an *obſcure, implicite Faith*, for ſuch *Doctrines* which are ſo far from any *evidence* of *Reaſon*.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the uſe and Authority of General Councils.

The denying the Infallibility of General Councils takes not away their uſe and Authority. Of the ſubmiſſion due to them by all particular perſons. How far external obedience is required in caſe they err. No violent oppoſition to be made againſt them. Rare Inconveniences hinder not the effect of a juſt power. It cannot rationally be ſuppoſed, that ſuch General Councils as are here meant ſhould often or dangerouſly err. The true notion of a General Council explained. The Freedom requiſite in the proceedings of it. The Rule it muſt judge by. Great difference between external obedience, and internal aſſent to the Decrees of Councils. This later unites men in error, not the former. As great uncertainties ſuppoſing General Councils Infallible as not. Not ſo great certainty requiſite for ſubmiſſion as Faith. Whether the Romaniſts Doctrine of the Infallibility of Councils, or ours, tend more to the Churches peace? St. Auſtin *explained. The Keyes according to him given to the Church. No unremediable inconvenience, ſuppoſing a General Council err. But errors in Faith are ſo, ſuppoſing them Infallible when they are not. The Church hath power to reverſe the Decrees of General Councils. The power of Councils not by Divine Inſtitution. The unreaſonableneſs of making the Infallibility of Councils depend on the Popes confirmation. No conſent among the Romaniſts about the ſubject of Infallibility, whether in Pope or Council. No evidence from Scripture, Reaſon, or Antiquity, for the Popes perſonal Infallibility.*

§. 1. THE *firſt queſtion* being thus diſpatched, I now come to the *ſecond*, which is, *Of what Uſe and Authority General Councils are in the Church, ſuppoſing them not Infallible?* And here again two things are to be examined; firſt, *How far general Councils are to be ſubmitted to.* Secondly, *Whether our opinion or yours tend more to the peace of the Church*; for both theſe his Lordſhip handles diſtinctly, and ſo ſhall we. For the firſt, nothing is more neceſſary than throughly to underſtand his Lordſhips
P. 245. meaning, which he moſt fully delivers in theſe words. *General Councils lawfully called and ordered and lawfully proceeding, are a great and awful repreſentation, and cannot err in matters of Faith, keeping themſelves to Gods rule, and not attempting to make a new one of their own; and are with all ſubmiſſion to be obſerved by every Chriſtian, where Scripture, or evident demonſtration, comes not againſt them.* Two things you mainly object againſt this opinion. 1. *That in caſe ſuch a Council err, it tends only to unite men in error.* 2. *Who ſhall be Judge of all thoſe conditions implyed in the Councils proceedings?* To theſe two, all that I can find material ſcattered up and down in your Diſcourſe on this Subject, may be reduced. For the *firſt*, we muſt conſider the occaſion of his Lordſhips entrance into this *ſubject* concerning *General Councils, how far they may err, or not*, which he ſaith, *is a queſtion of great conſequence in the Church of God. For to ſay they*
P. 223. *cannot err, leaves the Church not only without remedy againſt an error once determined; but alſo without ſenſe that it may need a remedy, and ſo without care to ſeek it, which is the miſery of the Church of* Rome *at this day. To ſay they can err, ſeems to expoſe the members of the Church to an uncertainty and wavering in the Faith, to make unquiet Spirits not only to diſreſpect former Councils of the Church, but alſo to ſlight and contemn whatſoever they may now determine.* So that, great inconveniences appearing on both ſides, his Lordſhip endeavours to ſteer his courſe ſo as not to daſh on the *rocks* of either

either side, by betraying the *Churches Faith* in asserting their *Infallibility*, or the *Churches peace* by acknowledging them *fallible*. But as he could not see any *reason* to believe them *Infallible*, so neither could he see any *necessity* that the *Churches peace* should be broken, supposing them not to be so. And the most obvious objection being, *If a General Council be fallible, what is to be done in case it should err?* For that, he propounds this *Expedient, That the* P. 224. *determination of a General Council erring was to stand in force, and to have external obedience at the least yielded to it, till evidence of Scripture, or a demonstration to the contrary made the errour appear; and until thereupon another Council of equal authority did reverse it.* And he after explains what he means by this *external obedience*, viz. *That which consists in silence, patience,* P. 226. *and forbearance yielded to it:* which he builds on this reason, *That Controversies arising in the Church must have some end or they'l tear all in sunder: therefore supposing a General Council should err, and an erring Decree be by the Law it self invalid, I would have it,* (saith he) *wisely considered again* (*supposing the Council not to err in Fundamental Verity*) *whether it be not fit to allow a General Council that honour and priviledge, which all other great Courts have; Namely that there be a declaration of the invalidity of its decrees, as well as of the Laws* P. 227. *of other Courts, before private men can take liberty to refuse obedience.* Therefore he concludes, *That this seems most fit and necessary for the peace of Christendom, unless in case the errour be manifest and intolerable, or that the whole Church upon peaceable and just complaint of this errour neglect or refuse to call a Council to examine it: and there come in National and Provincial Councils to reform for themselves.* These words contain the full account of his Lordships opinion, which you charge with so *many interclashings and inconveniences.* The first of which is, *That it tends only to oblige all the members of the Church to an Unity* P. 242. *in errour against Scripture and demonstration, during their whole lives, or rather to the worlds end; since such an* Utopian *rectifying Council as the Bishop here fancies, is morally impossible ever to be had; and therefore you call it a strange* (*not to say an impious*) *doctrine, advanced without authority of Gods Word, or Antiquity, nay contrary to all solid reason.*

This being a charge of the highest nature and manag'd with such unmeasurable confidence, we must somewhat further enquire into the grounds of his Lordships opinion, to see whether it be guilty of these crimes or no. §. 2. There are three things therefore must be cleared in order to his Lordships Vindication. 1. The design of his *Discourse*. 2. The suppositions he makes as to the proceedings of the *Council*. 3. The *obligation* of its decrees supposing that it should err.

1. *The design of his discourse* is to be considered; which is to remedy a supposable inconvenience, and to provide for the *Churches peace*. For the first question in debate was, *Whether a General Council might err, or no.* In which his Lordship gives sufficient evidence from *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, and *Reason*, that it might. But then here comes an inconvenience to be removed; for his *Adversary* objects, *What are we then nearer to Unity after a Council hath determin'd, supposing it may err?* To this his Lordship suits his Answer: wherein we ought to consider, that the inconvenience objected is, on his Lordships *suppositions*, one of the *rara contingentia*; and such a one ought not to destroy a principle of *Government* in all other cases useful and necessary. For there cannot possibly be any way thought of for peace and *Government*, but there may be a supposition made of some notable inconvenience; but that not being necessary, nor immediately consequent upon it, but something which may happen and far more probably may not, it ought not to hinder the obtaining of that, which is generally both useful and necessary. To give you a parallel case to this: It is granted on all hands that the *civil authority* of a Nation is Fallible, and therefore we

may ſuppoſe it actually to err, and that ſo far as to bind men by Law to ſomething in it ſelf unlawful. Will you ſay now, that the intent of *civil authority* is to bind men neceſſarily to ſin? I hope, you will not: but by this you may eaſily ſee the *fallacy* of your arguing againſt his Lordſhip; for it is an inconvenience indeed ſuppoſable, but not at all *neceſſary*; if he had ſaid indeed, that *General Councils* muſt neceſſarily err, your argument had been ſtrong againſt him; but as it is, it hath no more force againſt his aſſertion, than the ſuppoſition before made hath againſt civil authority. For that caſe may be eaſily put, that ſuch a *Law* may paſs; but, doth this hinder men from their *obligation* to duty and ſubmiſſion to a juſt authority? or, Will you have men preſently to renounce obedience, and to repeal ſuch a *Law* themſelves, and not rather in all wayes of duty and reverence to authority make known their juſt complaints and deſire a redreſs by the hands of Supream authority? And this is all which his Lordſhip aims at, that in caſe a *General Council* ſhould err (which is not eaſily imaginable upon his ſuppoſitions) it tends more to the *Churches peace* for private men not to oppoſe the Decrees of it, but to endeavour that another *General Council* be called to repeal it, and till then to preſerve the *Churches* peace, ſuppoſing the errour not manifeſt or intolerable. In this caſe then there are two inconveniences put: the one of them is, That when a *Council* is ſuppoſed to err, every particular man may be at liberty to oppoſe the Decrees of it, and ſo put the *Church* into confuſion; the other is, That though private men may know it to be an errour, yet they ſhould be patient till the *Church* by another *Council* may repeal it: now theſe two inconveniences being laid together, the queſtion is, Which is the greater? His Lordſhip with a great deal of *reaſon* judges the former to be: becauſe in the latter caſe it is only a *ſilencing* of ſome leſs neceſſary *truth* for ſome time; but in the other it is an expoſing the *Church* to the fury of mens turbulent *Spirits*. But that which ſhews the unreaſonableneſs of your objection, *That this is the way to bind the Church to an union in errour*, is, that this doth not neceſſarily follow from his Lordſhips opinion, but is only a caſe ſuppoſable: and no rare Inconvenience ought to prejudice a general good: And the peace of the *Church* in ſuch a caſe ought to be preferred before private mens ſatisfaction.

§. 3. But this will further appear, if we conſider, *ſecondly*, the *Suppoſitions* his Lordſhip makes; for by that we ſhall ſee, how rarely incident this caſe is: for, I hope, the ſuppoſing that a *General Council* may err, doth not ſuppoſe that it muſt neceſſarily err; and granting thoſe things which are ſuppoſed by him, it is a rare caſe that it ſhould err. For theſe things are by him ſuppoſed. 1. *That it muſt be a Council lawfully called and ordered*; and ſo, not ſuch Councils as that of *Trent* was, or any like it; wherein the *Pope* gives only a *General Summons*, and that it muſt be called a *General Council* on that account, how few *Biſhops* ſoever appear in it, nay, though the far greateſt part of the *Chriſtian* world be excluded from it: but it muſt be ſuch a *Council* as may be acknowledged to be *General*, by the *general Conſent* of the *Chriſtian world*. For that we would make our *Judge* in the caſe; as it was in the four firſt *General Councils*. Not that we would ſtand upon *Biſhops* being actually preſent from every particular *Church*, but that ſuch a number be preſent from the greateſt *Churches*, as may make it not be ſuſpected to be meerly a *Faction*, packed together for the *Intereſt* of ſome potent *Prelate*; but that they do ſo indifferently meet from all parts, that there may be no juſt ground of ſuſpicion, that they deſign any thing but the common good of the Chriſtian world. And therefore we acknowledge the firſt *four General Councils* to be truly ſuch, in our preſent ſenſe; neither do we quarrel at them, becauſe ſo few *Biſhops* were preſent, who

who lived out of the *Roman Empire*; for, ſuppoſing the *Church* at the ſame freedom from particular *Intereſſes* that it was then, and ſo great a number of *Biſhops* aſſembled together, we look on it to be *ſo great and awful a Repreſentation*, that its determinations ought not to be oppoſed by any *factious* or turbulent *Spirits*. And in caſe ſome *Biſhops* be not preſent from ſome *Churches*, whether *Eaſtern* or *Weſtern*, yet if upon the publiſhing thoſe *Decrees*, they be *univerſally accepted*, that doth, *ex poſt-facto*, make the *Council* truly *Oecumenical*. By this you ſee, what we mean by a *General Council*. And, for *the calling of it*; though we ſay, it ſhould be by the conſent of the chief *Patriarchs*, yet the right and cuſtom of the ancient *Church* clearly carries it, that it ought to be ſummoned by the authority of *Chriſtian Princes*: for, nothing can be more evident to ſuch, who will not ſhut their eyes againſt the cleareſt evidence, than that the firſt *General Councils* (before the *Pope* had got the better of the *Emperours*) were ſummoned by the *Emperours* command and authority; and ſince the diviſion of the *Empire* into ſo many *Kingdoms* and *Principalities*, the conſent of *Chriſtian Princes* is neceſſary on the ſame grounds. Neither ought it only to be a *General Council*, and *lawfully called*, but *lawfully ordered too, viz.* that no *Prelate* challenge himſelf ſuch a *Preſidency* not in, but over the *Council*, that his *Inſtructions* muſt be looked on as the only *Chart* they muſt *ſteer* their *courſe* by; and that nothing be debated, but *proponentibus Legatis*, as it was at *Trent*: for theſe things take away utterly that *Freedom* which is neceſſary for a *General Council*. And therefore his Lordſhip juſtly requires, 2. *That the Council do proceed lawfully*; which it cannot do, if it be *over-awed*, as the *ſecond Epheſine* was by *Dioſcorus* and his party; or if practices be uſed, as at *Ariminum*: but there muſt be the greateſt freedom in debates, no canvaſing for votes, but every one ſuffered to deliver his judgement, without prejudice or partiality, that thoſe who give their judgements, deliver their reaſons before, and not only appear *in Pontificalibus*, to give their *Placet*. That the *Biſhops* preſent, be men of unqueſtionable abilities, and generally preſumed to be well acquainted with the matters to be debated there: For otherwiſe nothing would be more eaſie, than for the more ſubtil men, under ambiguous expreſſions, and fair pretences to bring over a great number of the reſt to them, who want either judgement or learning enough to diſcern their deſigns. And this is ſuppoſed to be the caſe of the *Council* at *Ariminum*, where the *Occidental Biſhops*, for want of *learning* were over-reached by the ſubtilty of the *Arrian party*. 3. His Lordſhip ſuppoſes, *That this Council keeps it ſelf to Gods Rule, and not attempt to make a new one of their own*: For in ſo doing they commit an errour in the *firſt Concoction*, which will be *incorrigible* afterwards. And this is not only reaſonable, but juſt and neceſſary, becauſe nothing can be a Rule of Faith, but what is of immediate *divine Revelation*; and this hath been the practice of the firſt *General Councils*, which never owned or proceeded by any other Rule of *Faith* but this. Theſe things being ſuppoſed, May we not juſtly ſay, That an erring determination of ſuch a *Council* ſo proceeding, is a *rare caſe*? Since we believe, that *God* will not deny to any particular perſon (who doth ſincerely ſeek it) the *knowledge of his truth*, much leſs may we think he will do it to ſuch an *awful Repreſentation of the Church*, when aſſembled together purpoſely for finding out that truth, which may be of ſo great conſequence to the *Chriſtian world*. For both the *truth* of *Gods promiſes*, the *goodneſs of God* to his *people*, and his *peculiar care* of his *Church*, ſeem highly concerned, that ſuch a *Council* ſhould not be guilty of any notorious errour.

§. 4. But, becauſe we deny not, but ſuch a *Council* is fallible, therefore we grant the caſe may be put, that ſuch a *Council* may err; and the Queſtion is, What is to be done then? *Whether every particular perſon may oppoſe ſuch*

a determination, or submit till another Council reverse the Decrees of it. His Lordship asserts the latter; and so we come to the effect of such an erring Decree, which was the third thing to be spoken to. As to which, these things must be considered, 1. That he doth not assert, that men are bound to *believe* the *truth* of that *Decree*, but not *openly to oppose it*. For so he speaks expresly of *external obedience*, and *at least so far as it consists in silence, patience, and forbearance yielded to it.* And therefore you are greatly deceived, when with such confidence you assert, *That this obliges all the members of the Church to unity in errour*; for that is only consequent upon your principle, that the Decrees of *General Councils* are to be believed by an *internal Assent*: for this indeed would necessarily oblige them to *unity in errour*; but the most that is consequent on his Lordships Opinion, is, that in such cases wherein a *General Council* hath erred, men ought rather to be *silent* for a time as to some *truth*, than to break the *Churches peace*. In the mean time he doth not deny, but that men may be bound to follow their own *judgements* in the discovery of truth; nay, and they may use all means consistent with the *Churches peace*, to promote that *truth*; for he allows that *just complaints may be made to the Church for reversing the decrees of the former Council*, and this cannot be without discovering the errour of that *Council*. And I hope this liberty of dissent and just complaint, is sufficient to keep all the members of the Church from being united in *Errour*. And, I pray Sir, What cause is there now for such *hideous out-cryes, that this is such a strange and impious Doctrine, against Scripture, Antiquity, and solid Reason*, which appears, for all that I can see, very just and reasonable, taking it in the way which he explains himself in? But, whereas you object, *That this will keep men in errour to the worlds end, because such a Council is morally impossible*; it is easie to shew you, that if the *rectifying Council* be impossible, the *General erring Council* is equally impossible; therefore there is no danger coming that way neither. And that such *General Councils* are grown such morally impossible things, we may in a great measure thank your *Church* for it, which hates as much such a *true rectifying Council* (as you call it) as the *Court* of *Rome* does a *thorow Reformation*. For, all your design is, to perswade men, that those only are *General Councils*, which have the *Popes Summons*, and wherein he rules, and, in effect, does all; and to perswade men to believe the *Decrees* of such *Councils*, is the most effectual way in the world to *unite men in the belief of errours to the worlds end*. For, as long as the *Popes* Interest can carry it, to be sure, all *rectifying Councils*, shall be (as you say) *Utopian* too; for he will prevent, if possible, their ever appearing in *Europe*. Therefore all this discourse of his Lordship doth suppose such a state of the *Church*, as that was in the time of the *Nicene Councils*, and after; when there might be a liberty of calling such *Councils*, that in case one errs, another might be summoned to reverse it. But this is not to be expected *in face Romuli*, in this state of the *Christian world*, that there should be such a *General Council* so called, and so proceeding as he supposes, and therefore there is no such danger of *being united in errour*, by vertue of its Decrees; but if the state of things would bear such a *Council* so decreeing, we might as well think it would bear another to reverse it, if need were, and then his Lordships supposition would come to act, that in the interstice of those *Councils*, private men ought not to oppose the Decrees of the former, but patiently wait till the latter *reverse* them. But, as things are now in the Christian world, his Lordship doth not suppose that any *Council* hath such a power to oblige, because it calls it self a *General Council*; but a truly *General Council* being, as you say, morally impossible, nothing is left but that the *Church* reform it self by parts, and wait to give an account of its proceedings therein, till such a *General Council* as we before described, be assembled

assembled in the Christian world. Thus we see, how vain and empty your first Objection is, *That from his Lordships opinion, it would follow, that the Church must be united in errour*, which is only the direct consequent of your own assertion, that men are bound to believe the *Decrees* of those you call *General Councils to be Infallible.*

§. 5. Your next great Objection is, *That this Doctrine exposes all to uncertainties; for, Who shall be judge, whether it be a lawful Council, and proceeds lawfully? Whether the errours be fundamental and intolerable or no? Whether there be Scripture and demonstration against them or no? For, if every man be judge, there can be no such submission to any General Council.* This is the force of the many words, which, in several places, you spend upon this subject; and therefore I shall consider them together. I answer therefore, 1. In general, if this be so intolerable an inconvenience, it is unavoidable upon your own principles: and therefore it is unreasonable to object that to another, which you cannot quit your self of. For you say, That the *Infallibility of General Councils confirmed by the Pope*, is the best way to end Controversies; but there is not one term in the main Proposition, but is liable to the same uncertainty which you here object to his Lordship; for, 1. You do not say, that all *Councils* are Infallible, but only *General Councils*, Who then shall be judge, whether the *Council* you would have me believe, be *General* or no? You do not say, that all must be there to make a *General Council*, but the *Popes General Summons* is sufficient: But, *Who must be judge*, whether that be sufficient or no? You say so; but, I see no reason for it. Must you be my *judge*, or I my own? If I may be my own judge, so must every one else, and so every man is left to believe what *Councils to be General* he please himself. 2. You say, *General Councils are Infallible*: Who must be *judge* of that too? Must the *Council* be infallibly believed in it? But that is the thing in *Question*. Must the *Pope* be judge? *But no man* (you say) *is bound to believe him Infallible without the Council.* Must the *Scripture* be judge? But, Who must judge what the *sense* of the *Scripture* is? 3. Who must be *judge* in what sense, and how far the *Council* is *Infallible*? Who must *judge*, how the *Council* comes to be *Infallible* in the *Conclusion*, that was fallible in the *use* of the *means*? And when any Controversie arises concerning the *meaning* of the *Decrees* of the *Council*, Who must be *judge*, which is the Infallible *sense* of them? for there is but one *sense Infallible*, though the words may bear many, and unless I know which is the *Infallible sense*, I am not bound to yield my *assent* to it. But, Who must decide this? The *Council* cannot; for that leaves no exposition with the decrees. The *Pope* cannot; for he is not *Infallible* without the *Council*. So that still it falls to every mans private reason, to judge of it. 4. Who must be judge, that the *Popes Confirmation* is necessary to make the Decrees *Infallible*? Not the *Council* without the *Pope*, nor the *Pope* without the *Council*; for, you say, *We are not bound to believe them Infallible, but as they are together.* And together they cannot, for that is the Question, *Why not a Council without the Popes Confirmation, as well as with it?* and, When did *Pope* and *Council* determine, that no *Council* without the *Pope*, is Infallible? but the contrary hath been determined by a *Council, viz. that a Council is above the Pope*, and consequently needs not his Confirmation. So that for all your pretending to end Controversies, you leave men at as great uncertainties as any whatsoever. Being not able to resolve some of the most necessary Questions, in order to the *Churches* peace, according to your own principles.

P. 242, &c.
P. 260, &c.

§. 6. 2. I answer more particularly, that his Lordships opinion doth not expose near to so great *uncertainties* as yours doth; upon this reason, because you requiring an *internal assent* to the Decrees of *Councils*, and *Infallible Certainty* in all that men believe, must of necessity leave men in the greatest *perplexities*, where you cannot give them that kind of *Certainty* on which they

they may build their Faith; but, his Lordship only requiring *external obedience* to the Decrees of *Councils*, a far less degree of *Certainty* will be sufficient. That is, such a kind of *Moral Certainty*, as things of that nature are capable of. You ask then, *Who shall be judge, whether a Council were lawfully called, and did lawfully proceed or no?* I answer, let every man be judge according to the general sense and reason of mankind. If there were sufficient authority for calling them together, according to the known practice of the *Church*; if there was no plain ground of *suspicion* of any *practices* by the power of any particular *Prelate*; no complaints made of it, either in, or after the *Council*; if there be no plain evidence that it takes any other Rules for its Decrees, but the *Scripture*, then we say, They are bound to yield *external obedience* to them, supposing the *Council* generally received in the Christian world for a *lawful* and *General Council*. If you ask again, *How should it be known when errours are manifest and intolerable, and when not?* We here appeal to *Scripture* interpreted by the concurrent sense of the *Primitive Church*, the *common reason* of mankind (supposing the *Scripture* to be the *Rule* of *Faith*) the consent of wise and learned men; which certainly will prevent the exorbitances and capricious humours of any phantastical *Spirits*, which may cry out, That the most received *truths*, ever since Christianity was in the world, are *intolerable errours*. If you are resolved yet further to ask, *Who shall be judge what a necessary reason or demonstration is?* His Lordship tells you, I think plain enough, from *Hooker*, what is understood by it, *viz. such as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent to it.* And, Do you require any other judge but a mans own reason in this case? But, you say, *Others call their arguments demonstrations*; but let them submit to this way of tryal, and they may soon be convinced that they are not. Still you say, *They will not be convinced, but will break the peace of the Church, supposing they have sufficient evidence for what they say.* But if men will be unreasonable, who can help it? Can you, with telling them *Councils* are Infallible? I doubt you would hear of more arguments than you could well satisfie against that presently. We appeal then to the common *reason* of mankind, Whether it be not a far more probable way to end *Controversies*, to perswade men in disputable matters, to yield *external obedience* to the *Decrees* of a *lawful General Council*, than to tell them, they are bound to believe whatever they decree to be *infallibly true?* And there-
P. 262. fore you are very much mistaken, *when you say, His Lordship declines the main Question*, which is, *of the necessity of submitting to a living Judge, or a definitive sentence, in case two parties, equal for learning and integrity, both pretend to equal evidence for what they say*; for his Lordship doth not deny, but that in such a case the submitting to a definitive sentence, may be a reasonable way to end the *Controversie*; but then the difference between you lyes in two things. 1. That you would bind men to *internal assent* to the *Decrees* of a *Council*, as being *Infallible*; but his Lordship saith, They bind to *external obedience*, as being the *Supremest Judicatory can be expected in the Church*. 2. You pretend, *that Councils called and confirmed by the Pope, are thus Infallible, and our Supreme Judge in matters of Faith*; his Lordship justly denies that, and sayes, That a *Free General Council observing the same conditions which the first did, is the only equal and indifferent Judge*. So that the Question is not so much, Whether there shall be a *living Judge?* as, Who shall be he? and, How far the definitive *Sentence* binds? and, What is to be done, in case there cannot be a free and indifferent Judge? for in this case we say, Every *Church* is bound to regard her own purity and peace, and, in case of *corruptions*, to proceed to a *Reformation* of them.

§. 6. We now come to the remaining *Enquiry*, which is, *Whether your Doctrine, or ours, tends more to the Churches peace?* For clearing of this, his Lordship

ſhip premiſes theſe things by way of *Conſiderations*. 1. *That there is no neceſſity of any ſuch Infallibility in the Church, as was in the Apoſtles.* P. 253. 2. *That what Infallibility or Authority belongs to the Church, doth primarily reſide in the whole body of the Church, and not in a General Council.* P. 254. 3. *That in caſe a General Council err, the whole Church hath full Authority to repreſent her ſelf in another Council, and ſo to redreſs what was amiſs either practiſed, or concluded.* P. 256. And ſo upon theſe principles his Lordſhip ſaith, *Here is a ſufficient remedy for what is amiſs, and yet no infringing any lawful Authority in the Church; and yet he grants, as the Church of* England *doth, that a General Council may err.* But he ſaith, *It doth not follow, becauſe the Church may err, therefore ſhe may not govern.* P. 257. *For the Church hath not only a Paſtoral Power to teach and direct, but a Prætorian alſo, to controul and cenſure too where errours or crimes are againſt points fundamental, or of great conſequence.* Thus he repreſents the advantages which follow upon his opinion, after which he comes to the diſadvantages of yours. But we muſt firſt conſider, what you have to object againſt what his Lordſhip hath here delivered. To the firſt you ſay nothing, but that *Stapleton* and *Bellarmin* attribute more *Infallibility* to the *Church*, than his Lordſhip doth, which is an excellent way to prove the neceſſity of it, if you had firſt proved thoſe two Authors Infallible. P. 266. To the ſecond, your Anſwer is more large; for his Lordſhip to confirm what he ſaid, That the power and authority given by Chriſt, lyes in the whole *Church*, produces that ſaying of S. *Auſtin*, That S. *Peter did not receive the Keyes of the Church, but as ſuſtaining the perſon of the Church*; from whence he proves againſt *Stapleton, That it is not to be underſtood finally only for the good of the Church, but that the primary and formal right is in the Church. For he that receives a thing in the perſon of another, receives it indeed to his good and uſe, but in his right too.* To this you anſwer from *Bellarmin, That there is a twofold repreſenting or bearing the perſon of another, The one Parabolical, and by way of meer figure and ſuppoſition only; as* Agar *repreſented the people of the Jews under bondage of the Law,* &c. *The other hiſtorical and real,* viz. *when the perſon repreſenting, has right or relation* à parte rei, *in and towards the thing repreſented, by vertue whereof it bears the perſon of the thing repreſented: Now S.* Peter, ſay you, *ſuſtained the perſon of the Church in this latter ſenſe, really and hiſtorically, and not parabolically, and in figure,* i. e. *he received the Keyes as Head of the Church; though that Reception were ordained for the good of the whole Church.* But Sir, our enquiry is not, How many wayes one may imagine a *Repreſentation* to be made, but, What kind of Repreſentation that is, which is ſuitable to S. *Auſtin*'s meaning? That there may be an *Allegorical Repreſentation*, no body denies: but I cannot imagine, How it can belong to this place; or, Who ever meant that S. *Peter* ſtood here for an *Allegory* of the *Church?* and therefore the members of your diſtinction are not appoſite. For thoſe who aſſert, that S. *Peter* did ſuſtain the perſon of the *Church*, in his Lordſhips ſenſe, do yet acknowledge that he did it *hiſtoricè*, and not *parabolicè*, as you ſpeak, *i. e.* the *donation* was *really* made to him; but then the Queſtion is, In what *right* or *capacity* it was made to him, Whether in his *perſonal* or *repreſentative* capacity? For, theſe are the two only proper members of a diſtinction here. St. *Auſtin* ſaith, not only in that place, but in very many others, that S. *Peter* did ſuſtain the *perſon of the Church, when Chriſt ſaid to him, I will give thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*; Now the Queſtion is, In what ſenſe he ſuſtained the *perſon* of the *Church?* You ſay, In his *own right as Head of the Church*; We ſay, As a *publick perſon* repreſenting the *Church*, not *parabolically* (for that is no ſuſtaining the *perſon* at all) but *really* and *hiſtorically*. And that S. *Auſtin* means, As a *publick perſon*, appears by the other expreſſions in the places cited, that he did *univerſam ſignificare Eccleſiam*, ſignifie

Aug. de Agon. Chriſtiano, cap. 30.

De Pontif. l. 1. c. 12.

Aug. in Pſal. 108. in ſ hxn. tr. 124. Serm. 30. de diverſ. Retract. l. 1. c. 21.

ſignifie the whole Church; and that thoſe things which are ſpoken of *Peter*, *Non habent illuſtrem intellectum niſi cum referuntur ad Eccleſiam cujus ille agnoſcitur in figurâ geſtâſſe perſonam, Have no clear ſenſe, but when they are referred to the Church, whoſe perſon he did bear.* Can you ſay this *of a King, who receives the Keyes of a Town, whereof he takes poſſeſſion for himſelf, though it be for the good of the Kingdom; that he ſignifies the whole Kingdom in it, and that it cannot have any clear ſenſe, but when it is applied to the Kingdom which he repreſents?* No, this cannot be; for the *King* takes poſſeſſion in his own *full right*, and it is not the *poſſeſſion*, but the *adminiſtration*, which is referred properly to the *good* of the *Kingdom*. But this might be properly ſaid of a *Duke* of *Venice*, that he takes poſſeſſion of a *Town* in the perſon of the *State*, and that the proper ſenſe is, that the *State* took *poſſeſſion*, and he only repreſenting it. So that the full right lyes in the *body* of the *State*, but he as *chief member* repreſents the whole. And this is that which S. *Auſtin* means, when he ſaith, That S. *Peter* repreſented the *Church, propter primatum, for the Primacy* which he had amongſt the *Apoſtles, i. e.* ſuch a *Primacy of order*, whereby he was fitteſt to repreſent the whole *Church.* For it is impoſſible to conceive that he ſhould mean that S. *Peter* ſhould receive this as *Head of the Church*, when you acknowledge that he was not *Head of the Church*, till after the *Keyes were given him*. For, you ſay, The *performance* of *Chriſt's promiſe*, in making him *Head of the Church*, was not till after his *reſurrection*. But, Will you ſay, the *Church* had no power of the *Keyes* till then; and then only *finally* too, and not *formally?* What became then of the power of the *Keyes* at S. *Peters* death, if only *formally* in him, and not in the *Church?* What becomes of them at the *death* of every *Pope?* Will you ſay, as *Bellarmin* doth, that *Chriſt* takes them, and gives them to his Succeſſour? But he muſt be ſure to wait till the *Cardinals* agree, To whom he muſt give them. Nothing then could be further from S. *Auſtin's* meaning, than that S. *Peter* received the *Keyes*, as *Head of the Church*, and ſo, that he repreſented the *Church* only *finally*; whereas his expreſſions carry it, that he means the *formal right* of them was conveyed to the *Church*, and that S. *Peter* was only a *publick perſon*, to receive them in the name of the *Church*. But, whatever S. *Auſtin's* meaning was, the ſtrength of his Lordſhips aſſertion doth not ſtand or fall with that; for there are arguments ſufficient beſides to prove, that the *Authority* for *governing* the *Church*, was not committed *formally* to S. *Peter*, much leſs to any pretended ſucceſſour, but that it primarily and formally reſides in the whole *body* of the *Church*. And, were that the thing to be here diſputed, you muſt not think to take it for granted, that if the *Keyes* were given perſonally to S. *Peter*, by them was meant the *Supreme Authority* of governing the *Church* excluſively of the other *Apoſtles*.

§. 7. P. 267. To the third *Conſideration*, you anſwer, *That in caſe a General Council err, there can be no redreſs for errour in Faith; for if one Council may err, ſo may another, and a third, and a fourth, &c.* This indeed is very ſuitable to your Doctrine from the beginning, that a man can be *certain* of nothing but what it is impoſſible ſhould be otherwiſe. I hope you are certain your ſelf, you do not err; but I ſuppoſe you do not think it *impoſſible* you ſhould: So, although we do not think it impoſſible, a *Council* ſhould err, yet we may be certain it doth not: and, ſuppoſing it ſhould, we do not ſay, It is impoſſible that a *Council* ſhould not *err*, ſo that another *Council* may correct the errour of the former. And doubtleſs men may be certain of it too; if, as his Lordſhip ſaith, *plain Scripture, and evident demonſtration* be brought againſt the former errour. But theſe are ſtrange Doctrines, that becauſe a *Council* may err, therefore a *Council* can never afford remedy againſt inconveniencies. For, one great inconvenience is, the *breaking* the *Churches peace*: that, is remedied by the *Councils*

cils Authority; another is, *errour in Faith*, that may be remedied by another *Council*: *No*, ſay you, *for that may err too*; but, Doth it follow that it *muſt err?* or, Is it probable that it ſhould err? if the former *errour* be ſo diſcovered, and the *Council* ſo proceed as his Lordſhip ſuppoſes. For your other difficulty *about the calling another General Council*, I have anſwered it already, when I ſhewed, what we meant by a *General Council*, and when it was *lawfully call'd*. When you after add, *That the Church never repreſented her ſelf in another Council but where the former Council was unlawful; and inſtance in the Councils of* Ariminum *and* Epheſus: you ſay the ſame which his Lordſhip doth, for theſe *Councils* were therefore accounted unlawful becauſe *erroneous* and *factious*, and he never aſſerts the neceſſity of calling a *new Council*, but in thoſe two caſes. But if you would have us account none ſuch, but whom you do, you muſt excuſe us till we ſee greater reaſon for it than we do yet: and ſo likewiſe for what follows, that the *Councils which rectified the errours of thoſe were called by the Popes authority, as that of* Trent *and others were*, which to ſpeak mildly is a groſs untruth. P. 258.

You urge from his Lordſhips granting, *That the Church hath a Prætorian power to controul and cenſure too, where errours or crimes are againſt points Fundamental or of great conſequence*; that *therefore he and all Proteſtants are juſtly cenſured by the Roman Church for oppoſing thoſe Doctrines which are with her Fundamental and of great conſequence.* But ſtill there is no difference with you between the *Roman Church* and the *Catholick*; between *Papal Councils*, and *Free and General*; between what ſhe judges Fundamental, and what all are bound to judge ſo. If you prove then, that we are bound to rely only on the judgement of your *Church*, your conſequence is good; but otherwiſe it is tyed with a rope of ſand, and therefore we do not fear the *laſhes* of it. And the ſame fault runs through your ſubſequent diſcourſe, in which you ſuppoſe the *Church Infallible in all ſhe propounds*, which you know is conſtantly denyed, and hath been at large diſproved in our firſt Part. For, the ground of your *reſolution of Faith being removed*, I ſee the Fabrick of your *Church* falls down with it. For take but away your pretence of *Infallibility*, and your confounding the *Catholick and Roman Church*; all the reſt moulders, as not being able to ſtand without them. But that is ſtill your way, if any thing be ſaid of the *Catholick Church*, we muſt preſently underſtand it of yours; ſo that it cannot be ſaid in any ſenſe *that the Church is without ſpot or wrinkle*, but by you it muſt be underſtood preſently of the *Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church univerſally received as a matter of Faith*: but till you prove not only your two former aſſertions, but that St. *Auſtin* underſtood thoſe words ever in that ſenſe, your vindication of that *place* in him concerning it, will appear utterly impertinent to your purpoſe. And his Lordſhips aſſertion may ſtill ſtand good, *That the Church on earth is not any freer from wrinkles in Doctrine and Diſcipline, than ſhe is from ſpots in life and Converſation.* P. 269. Ibid.

§. 8. Having thus vindicated his Lordſhips way from the objections you raiſed againſt it, we muſt now conſider how well you vindicate your own from the *unreaſonableneſs* he charges it with, in ſeveral particulars. 1. *That if we ſuppoſe a General Council Infallible, and it prove not ſo, but that an errour in Faith be concluded; the ſame erring opinion, which makes it think it ſelf Infallible, makes the errour of it irrevocable, and ſo leaves the Church without remedy.* To this you Anſwer, *Grant falſe antecedents and falſe premiſes enough, and what abſurdities will not be conſequent, and fill up the concluſion?* But you clearly miſtake the preſent buſineſs; which is not, Whether *Councils* be Infallible or no? but, Whether opinion be lyable to greater Inconveniencies, that which aſſerts that they may, or that they cannot err? Will you have your ſuppoſition of the *Infallibility* of *Councils* P. 258. P. 269.

taken for a *first principle*, or a thing as true as the *Scriptures?* So you would seem indeed, *by the supposing the Scriptures not to be Gods Word*, which you sub-
P. 270. joyn as the *parallel*, *to the supposing General Councils fallible.* But will you say the one is as evident and built on as good reason, and as much agreed on among *Christians*, as the other is? I suppose, you will not: and therefore it was very absurd and unreasonable to say, *Supposing the Word of God were not so, errours would be irrevocable, as if General Councils were supposed Infallible and proved not so.* But this is a Question you grant to be disputable among Christians, and will you not give us leave to make a supposition that it may prove not so? You must consider, we are now enquiring into the *conveniencies* of these two *opinions*, and in that case it is necessary to make such suppositions: And let any reasonable man judge what opinion can be more pernicious to the *Church* than yours is, supposing it not to be true: for then it will be necessary for men to assent to the *grossest errours*, as the most *Divine* and *Infallible truths:* and there can be no remedy imagin'd for the redress of them. If then the Inconvenience of admitting it be so great, men had need look well to the grounds on which it is built. And I cannot see any reason men can have to admit any *Infallible proponent in matters of Faith* to the *Church*, but on as great and as clear evidence, as the *Prophets* and *Apostles* had, that they were sent from *God.* For the danger may be as great to believe that to be *Infallible* which is not, as not to believe that to be *Infallible* which is: for the believing an errour to be a *Divine truth*, may be as dangerous to the *souls* of men, as the not believing something which is really revealed by *God.* But to be sure, those who see no reason to believe a *General Council* to be *Infallible*, cannot be obliged to *assent* to *errours* propounded by it; but such who believe it *Infallible* must, whatever the errours be, swallow them down, without questioning the truth of them. And it argues how conscious you are of the falsenes of your *principles*, that you are so loth to have them examined, or so much as a supposition made that they should not prove true: Whereas *truth* alwayes invites men to the most accurate search into it. We see the *Apostles* bid men *search*, whether the things they spake were *true* or no; and those are most commended who did it most, and I hope men were as much bound to believe them *Infallible* as *General Councils.* But we see how unreasonable you are, you would obtrude such things upon mens Faith, which must lead them into unavoidable *errours* if false, and yet not allow men the liberty of examination, whether they be *true* or no. But such proceedings are so far from advancing your cause, that nothing can more prejudice it among rational and inquisitive men.

His Lordship for the clearing this, proceeds to an Instance of an *errour*
P. 259. defined by one of your *General Councils*, viz. *Communion in one kind*; but that we shall reserve the discussion of, to the ensuing Chapter; which is purposely allotted for the discovery of those *errours* which have been defined by such as you call *General Councils.* Therefore I proceed.

§. 9. 2. His Lordship saith, *Your opinion is yet more unreasonable, because no*
P. 260. *Body-collective, whensoever it assembled it self, did ever give more power to the representing body of it, than a binding power upon it self and all particulars; nor ever did it give this power otherwise, than with this reservation in nature, that it would call again, and reform, and, if need were, abrogate any Law, or ordinance upon just cause made evident that the representing Body had failed in trust, or truth. And this power no Body-collective, ecclesiastical or civil, can put out of it self, or give away to a Parliament, or Council, or call it what you*
P. 272. *will that represents it.* To this again you Answer, *This is only to suppose and take for granted, that a General Council hath no Authority, but what is meerly delegate from the Church Universal which it represents.* I grant, this

is

is ſuppoſed in it, and this is all which the nature of a repreſentative body doth imply; if you ſay, there is more than that, you are bound to prove it. Yes, ſay you, *We maintain its Authority to be of Divine Inſtitution, and when lawfully aſſembled to act by Divine right, and not meerly by deputation and conſent of the Church.* But if all the proof you have for it, be only that which you refer us to in the precedent *Chapter*, the palpable weakneſs of it for any ſuch purpoſe hath been there fully laid open. His Lordſhip ſaith, *That the power which a Council hath to order, ſettle and define differences ariſing concerning Faith, it hath not by any Immediate Inſtitution from Chriſt, but it was prudently taken up by the Church from the Apoſtles example. So that to hold Councils to this end, is apparent Apoſtolical Tradition written: but the power which Councils have, is from the whole Catholick Church, whoſe members they are, and the Churches power from God.* You ſay, *True it is, the calling ſuch aſſemblies was taken up, and hath for its pattern the example of the Apoſtles*, Act. 15. *yet ſurely there is little doubt to be made, but the Apoſtles had both direction and precept too, for doing it ſo often as juſt occaſion required, from Chriſt himſelf.* The whole force of which Anſwer lyes in thoſe well placed words, *Surely there is little doubt to be made*; for as to any thing of reaſon, you never offer at it. Juſt ſuch another of *Bellarmins Sine dubio's* comes after; *Though a General Council be the Church repreſentative, and do not meet, or aſſemble together* hic & nunc, *but by order and deputation from man; yet it follows not, but the power and authority by which they act when they are met may be from God, as doubtleſs it is.* Can any man have the face to queſtion, Whether the Authority of *General Councils* be of *Divine Inſtitution* or no, when you ſay, *Yes ſurely, there is no doubt to be made of it, doubtleſs it is?* We do not queſtion, as you would ſeem to imply afterwards, *Whether the people or the Paſtours have right to ſend to General Councils*, but what ground you have to aſſert, that *General Councils are an immediate Divine Inſtitution.* But I muſt needs ſay, I never ſaw any thing affirmed oftner, and offered to be proved leſs, than that is here: and yet as though you had done it invincibly you triumphantly proceed; *General Councils then, are a principal and neceſſary part of that Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy which Chriſt inſtituted for the Government of his Church, and not an humane Expedient only, taken up by the Church her ſelf meerly upon prudential conſiderations, as the Biſhop will needs conceive.* It ſtrangely puzzles me to find out any thing that Particle *then* relates to; and after all my ſearch can find nothing, but *ſurely, without doubt, and doubtleſs.* I pray Sir, think not ſo meanly of us, that we ſhould take theſe for Arguments or Demonſtrations: Deal fairly with us, and if we fall by the *force* of reaſon, we yield our ſelves up to you. But you are very much deceived, if you think theſe things are taken for proofs with us: we can eaſily diſcern the weakneſs of your cauſe through the moſt confident affirmations. If you had brought any *Law* of *Chriſt*, appointing that *Generals Councils* ſhould be in the *Church*, any *Apoſtolical precept*, preſcribing or giving directions concerning them, you had done ſomething; but, not ſo much as to offer at a proof, and yet conclude it as confidently as if it were impoſſible to reſiſt the force of your Demonſtrations, is an evidence, that either you know your cauſe to be weak, or ſuppoſe us to be ſo. Much ſuch another diſcourſe is that which follows, wherein you pretend to give a reaſon, *Why what is defined by one Council in point of Doctrine cannot be reverſed by another.* Which is, *becauſe the true Chriſtian Faith is* ex natura rei *unchangeable, that it admits not of yea and nay, but only yea; that it is alwayes the ſame, that it muſt ſtand without alteration for ever, nay that it is to be invariable and admit no change.* All theſe expreſſions we have in one *Paragraph*, and, for all that I ſee, are the greateſt ſtrength of it. But what is it you mean by all this? Do you think we could not underſtand

P. 261.

P. 273.

P. 273.

what you meant by the *unchangeableneſs of Chriſtian Faith*, without ſo many diverſified expreſſions of it? And what follows now from all this? *That one Council cannot repeal the Decrees of another?* How ſo? was not the *Faith of Chriſt* as *unchangeable* in the time of the *Arrian Councils*, as it is now? and yet then one *Council* repealed the Decrees of others, in point of Doctrine; and yet by that nothing was derogated from the *Inſtitution* or *honour of Chriſt*, by ſuch a reverſing thoſe Decrees. Though the *Faith*, *i. e. The Doctrine of Chriſt*, be alwayes the ſame, Doth it thence follow; then men ſhall alwayes believe all this unalterable Doctrine? If ſo, how came *Arrianiſm* to overſpread the *Church?* How came ſix hundred *Biſhops* at the *Council* of *Ariminum* to be deceived in a *Doctrine of Faith*, by your own confeſſion? It is therefore a profound miſtake, to infer from the fallibility of *General Councils* the *alteration* of the *Faith of Chriſt*. The *Faith of Chriſt* is founded on a ſurer bottom than the *Decrees* of *Councils*, *though all men are lyars God is true, and Chriſt the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for ever*. But of this more afterwards.

§. 10. P. 274, 275. P. 261. You would ſeem to argue more pertinently in the following pages againſt his Lordſhips opinion: for you ſay, *He ſayes and unſayes the ſame; and what he ſeems to attribute to General Councils in one propoſition, he takes away in another.* That which his Lordſhip ſayes, is, *That the definitions of a General Council are binding to all particulars, and it ſelf; but yet ſo, that they cannot bind the whole Church from calling again, and in the after-calls upon juſt cauſe to order, and, if need be, to abrogate former acts. And after adds, And becauſe the whole Church can meet no other way, the Council ſhall remain the Supream, external, living, temporary, Eccleſiaſtical Judge of all Controverſies. Only the whole Church, and ſhe alone, hath power when Scripture or Demonſtration is found, and peaceably tendered to her, to repreſent her ſelf again in a new Council, and in it to order what was amiſs.* Now we muſt conſider what we find contradictious and repugnant to themſelves in theſe words: Three things, if I miſtake not, the main of this charge may be reduced to, 1. *That men ſhould be bound to that which Scripture and Demonſtration be againſt.*; But this is very eaſily anſwered, for his Lordſhip doth not ſay, Men are bound to *believe* it, but not ſo to oppoſe it as to break the peace of the *Church* by it. 2. *That another Council cannot be call'd without oppoſition to the other:* this his Lordſhip prevented, by ſuppoſing that the *juſt reaſons* againſt the decrees of the former *Council* ought to be *peaceably tendred* to the *Church*; but no boiſterous oppoſition to be made againſt it. 3. *To what purpoſe ſhould another Council be call'd, if the whole Church be ſatisfied that there is Scripture and Demonſtration againſt the decrees of the former?* But, 1. His Lordſhip ſuppoſes there may *Scripture* and *Demonſtration* be, where the whole *Church* is not ſatisfied; and therefore there may be neceſſity of calling another *Council*. 2. That the *Council* may free all thoſe who may ſuppoſe themſelves ſtill bound not to *oppoſe* the former errour. 3. That no *erroneous Decree* of a *Council*, may remain unrepealed in the *Church:* that ſo no erroneous perſon may challenge ſuch a Decree of a *Council*, as a ground for his oppoſition to the Doctrine of the *Church*. And where now lyes any ſuch appearance of contradiction in his Lordſhips words?

§. 11. P. 262. 3. The laſt thing his Lordſhip chargeth your way with *unreaſonableneſs* in, is, *That you do not only make the definition of a General Council, but the ſentence of the Pope Infallible; nay, more Infallible than it. For, any General Council may err with you, if the Pope confirm it not. So belike this Infallibility reſts not in the repreſentative body, the Council, nor in the whole body the Church, but in your Head of the Church, the Pope of* Rome. *And if this be ſo, To what end ſuch a trouble for a General Council? or, Wherein are we nearer to unity, if the Pope confirm it not?* To this you anſwer, 1. *That a General*

P. 276.

Council

Council is not held by you to be Infallible at all, unleſs it involve the Pope, or his Confirmation; and ſo there is but one Infallibility, viz. *of the Pope preſiding in, and confirming of the votes of a General Council.* 2. *You confeſs there are two different Opinions among you; the firſt and more common is, that the Pope, even without a General Council, is Infallible in his definitions of Faith, when he teaches the whole Church; the ſecond is, that he is not Infallible in his definitions, ſave only where he defines in, and with, a General Council. Now the Biſhop* (you ſay) *takes no notice of the ſecond Opinion, but only of the firſt, as though that were the Opinion of all Catholick Doctors. But, for your part, you will not meddle much with any matters of private Opinion or diſpute, and therefore you will briefly paſs over what his Lordſhip ſaith further, and only correct ſome miſtakes of his.* But whereas you pretend it only neceſſary to believe, that *Pope and Council together are Infallible, for this all Catholicks are agreed in; but, whether the Pope be Infallible without a Council or no, you leave it as matter of diſpute.* I ſhall manifeſt, how great a cheat you put upon the world by this Aſſertion, in theſe two things, 1. *That there is no ſuch agreement among your ſelves in this common principle, as you pretend.* 2. *That from the making the Popes Confirmation neceſſary to the Infallibility of the Council, you muſt make the Pope Infallible without a Council.* 1. Whereas you pretend ſuch a conſent among all *Catholicks* in this common principle, *That Pope and Council are Infallible together*, it is evident that there is no ſuch thing. For, 1. Some among you have aſſerted, that the *repreſentative body of the Church* is not at all the *ſubject* of *Infallibility*, but the *diffuſive*. For *Occham* contends at large, *That the priviledge of Infallibility, belongs only to the whole Militant Church; and neither to the Pope, nor General Council, nor body of the Clergy.* And ſo likewiſe doth *Petrus de Alliaco, Cuſanus, Antoninus* of *Florence, Panormitan, Nicolaus de Clemangis, Franciſcus Mirandula*, and others, whoſe words you may find at large in ſome of your Writers, and therefore I forbear repeating them. 2. Some aſſert, that *Councils* are no further *Infallible*, than they adhere to *Univerſal Tradition*; and you cannot be ignorant, who they are at this day among you, who aſſert this doctrine. 3. Some further ſay, That *Councils are in themſelves Infallible*, and therefore muſt be ſo, whether the *Pope* confirm them or no. And this opinion, however now you ſay, it be not ſo *common* as the other, yet it is certain, that before the *Council* of *Lateran* under *Leo* 10. it was much the more common opinion, as appears by the *Councils* of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*. And, that there is an irreconcileable difference between the *Authours* of this Opinion, and thoſe who make the *Popes* Confirmation neceſſary to the *Infallibility* of a *General Council*, I ſhall prove out of *Bellarmin* himſelf, from the ſtate of the Queſtion, and the Arguments he urges againſt it. *Bellarmin* tells us, *The firſt occaſion of this Controverſie, was about the depoſition of Popes*, viz. *whether the Pope might againſt his conſent be judged, condemned, and depoſed by the Council:* and therefore, ſaith he, *They are miſtaken, who think the Queſtion is, Whether the Council with the Pope be greater than the Pope without a Council? for, it cannot be conceived he ſhould give conſent to his own depoſition.* And this he proves *from the Council at* Baſil, *who defined their Council to be above the Pope, at that time, when neither the Pope, nor his Legats were preſent.* And this *Council* of *Baſil* in their *Synodal Epiſtle*, declare a *General Council*, *as repreſenting the Univerſal Church, to be Infallible*, when at the ſame time they aſſert, *That Popes have fallen into Hereſie.* Now, Can any one poſſibly imagine, theſe men ſhould believe the *Popes Confirmation* to be neceſſary to the *Councils Infallibility*, who ſuppoſe the *Pope* may be an *Heretick* at the ſame time, in which a

Occham Dialog. p. 1. l. 5. cap. 25, 29, 31. Cameracenſis quæſt. Veſp. art. 3. ad liter. O. & P. Cuſan. Concord. Cathol. l. 2. c. 3. Antonin. Summ. Summarum, p. 3. Tit. 23. c. 2. ſect. 6. Panormitan. decret. p. 1. l. 1. Tit. de elect. cap. ſignificaſti. Clemangis diſput. de Concil. Gener. Mirandula de fide & ordine credend. Theoren. 4. &c.

Bellarm. de Concil. l. 2. c. 13.

Council

Council may be Infallible? And when they aſſert it to belong to the *Council* only to pronounce, Whether the *Pope* be guilty of *Hereſie* or no? Thoſe therefore who contend for the *Councils Authority* above the *Pope*, do not at all look at the *Popes* Confirmation, as neceſſary to make the Decrees *Infallible*; though ſome of them may, to make them *Canonical*. For there lyes one of your fallacies; becauſe they look on the *Pope* as *Miniſterial Head* of the *Church*, therefore to make *Canons* to be valid, they may judge it in moſt caſes neceſſary that the *Pope* confirm the Decrees; but yet, they do not ſuppoſe this *Confirmation* doth at all make them *Infallible*; but, whether the *Pope* had confirmed them or no, they had been *Infallible* however. So that you cannot ſay, *That it is a principle of Faith among you, that Pope and Council together are Infallible*; for thoſe of this opinion make it a *principle of Faith*, that the *Council* in it ſelf is *Infallible*, and conſequently, whether it be confirmed by the *Pope* or no. And therefore *Bellarmin* ſaith, Their opinion is, *That in caſe the Pope be dead, depoſed, or refuſeth to come to the Council, the Council is not at all the leſs perfect, but that it hath full power to make definitions in matters of Faith.* And when he comes to urge againſt this Opinion, one of his *arguments* is, that from hence it follows, *That the Council would not at all need the Popes Confirmation*; and another, *That Councils without the Pope may err in Decrees of Faith*; for which he inſtanceth in *the Councils of Sirmium, Milan, Ariminum, Epheſus, &c. Neither*, ſaith he, *can it be anſwered, that theſe Councils erred, becauſe they were unlawful Councils; for the moſt of them wanted nothing but the Popes conſent, and the ſecond Epheſine Council was juſt ſuch another as that of* Baſil. From which diſputation of *Bellarmin*, it is both clear, that thoſe who make *Councils* above the *Pope*, do not judge the *Popes* Confirmation neceſſary; and thoſe who judge it neceſſary, do not ſuppoſe the *Council* Infallible without it. So that you are either deceived your ſelf, or would deceive others, when you would make them believe that there is but one *Infallibility* aſſerted by you, whereas nothing can be more evident, than that two diſtinct *ſubjects* of *Infallibility* are aſſerted in your *Church*, ſome placing it in the *Council* without the *Pope*, and others in the *Pope*, and not in the *Council*, and neither of them abſolutely and formally in the *Pope* and *Council* together.

De Concil. l. 2. c. 14.

c. 16.

§. 12. 2. I ſhall therefore more fully ſhew, *That thoſe who make the Popes Confirmation neceſſary, do really place the Infallibility in the Pope, and not in the Council*; and that from theſe things, 1. Becauſe they in terms aſſert, *That though nothing be wanting to a Council*, but the *Popes Confirmation, it may err, if the Pope confirm it not.* And this we produced *Bellarmins* aſſertion for already, giving that as the only reaſon, why thoſe *Councils* did err, which wanted nothing but that. Nay, he elſewhere aſſerts, *Not only that General Councils may err, though the Pope confirm them not, but although the Popes Legats be preſent, and conſent with the Council, yet if they do not follow the certain inſtruction of the Pope, the Council may err.* And, Can any one then poſſibly conceive, that the Infallibility lyes any where but in the *Pope?* 2. You aſſert, *That all the Power and Infallibility which is in the Church, is formally in the Pope, and only finally in the Church, becauſe it is for the good of the Church*; this I ſuppoſe you have not forgot, ſince you told us, that S. *Peter ſuſtained the perſon of the Church* hiſtoricè, *and not* parabolicè, *and that the fulneſs of all Eccleſiaſtical Power was in him as Head of the Church*: If this be true, as there you aſſert it confidently, whatever you pretend here, you are bound to defend, that all the *Infallibility* in the *Council* comes wholly from the *Pope*; for I know you will not place *Infallibility* in one, and the *fulneſs of Eccleſiaſtical Power* in another. 3. Becauſe *the main ground* of the *reprobating Councils lyes in the Popes diſſent.* So that *Councils* which in all other particulars are accounted lawful and general,

L. 2. de Concil. c. 11.

P. 265.

general, yet if any thing paſſed diſpleaſing in them to the *Pope*, ſo far they are *reprobated*; as the proceedings of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, in reference to the *Popes*, do ſufficiently teſtifie. For, although they were the ſame perſons, acting with equal *freedom* in thoſe, as in other things, yet when they came to touch any thing of the *Popes Intereſs*, then, becauſe the *Pope* doth not conſent, ſo far they were not *Infallible*. By which it is plain, that, though the *Council* ſtands for a *ſhew* and *blind* to the world, all the *Infallibility* lyes wholly in the *Pope*. And by this means, to be ſure, the *Pope* ſhall never receive any hurt by *General Councils*; for if he pleaſes, the *Council* ſhall either be approved or rejected, or partly approved, and partly rejected; or neither approved, nor rejected; for of all theſe ſorts *Bellarmin* tells us *Councils* are: which in ſhort is, The *Councils* which make for the *Popes* turn, are *Infallible*, but none other. And therefore *Bellarmin*, very conſonantly to his principles, ſayes expreſly, *Totam firmitatem Conciliorum legitimorum eſſe à Pontifice, non partim à Pontifice, partim à Concilio; The whole ſtrength of lawful Councils depends wholly on the Pope, and not partly on the Pope, and partly on the Council.* And if their *firmneſs* doth, their *Infallibility* muſt do ſo too. This is not a meer private opinion of his, but that which doth neceſſarily follow, from the making the *Popes* Confirmation neceſſary to the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*. Although therefore you would fain put off this as a matter of diſpute among your ſelves; yet it can be no matter of diſpute any more, than, Whether the Decrees of *Councils*, as confirmed by the *Pope*, be Infallible or no? And therefore all that his Lordſhip objects, falls upon all ſuch who aſſert this: Whereof the firſt which you mention is, *That then the Council is called but only in effect, to hear the Pope give his Sentence in more ſtate.* To which you anſwer, *That the Objection hath the ſame force againſt the Council called in the Apoſtles time*, viz. *that it was done, only to hear S.* Peter *pronounce his Sentence in more ſtate.* Neither had it been any more, if the Infallibility of the *Council* had only depended on S. *Peters* Sentence: but I hope you will not deny the reſt of the *Apoſtles* to have been as *Infallible* as S. *Peter* was. But you anſwer, 2. *That the Pope being to uſe all means morally requiſite to find out the truth; the Council is called really to help and aſſiſt the Pope; and the advice of the Council is a neceſſary* Medium *to his Holineſs, whereby to make a full inſpection into the matters he is to define.* But all this only confirms what his Lordſhip ſaith, *That it is for his giving Sentence in more ſtate*; for the *Council* is only a ſubſervient *means*, and contributes nothing at all to the *Infallibility* of the *Sentence*. But, you ſay, *They are a neceſſary Medium.* 1. Then the *Pope* cannot define any matter of Faith without a *General Council*. Which, all who aſſert that Opinion, utterly deny; for they ſay, The *Pope* may define matters of *Faith* without a *General Council*; and *Bellarmin* ſaith, *That the ſtate of the Church, without General Councils (which was for three hundred years) might have continued ſo to the worlds end; and therefore it was neceſſary there ſhould be a living Judge, whoſe Infallibility ſhould not depend upon any Council:* And elſewhere he ſayes, *That if ſeven Hereſies have been condemned by ſeven General Councils; more than a hundred have been condemned without, by the Pope and Provincial Councils.* 2. Though the *Pope* muſt uſe all moral means, yet, Why muſt a *General Council* be that *neceſſary Medium?* Why may not a *Provincial*, or leſſer *Council* ſerve turn? And ſo *Bellarmin* tells you, it would; he ſaith, indeed *ſome kind of Council is neceſſary*, magnum aut parvum, unum vel plura, prout ipſe judicaverit, *great or little, more or leſs, as the Pope ſhall judge fitting*; ſo that ſtill a *General Council* is but a *piece of ſtate*, for all *moral means* might be uſed without one. 3. What uſe are theſe *moral means* for? to enable him to paſs a right judgement, or no? If they be, then the *Pope* is bound to pronounce according to the Decree of the *Council*, and ſo it will not

De Pontif. Rom. l. 4. c. 3.

Ibid.

De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 3

De Concil. l. 1. c. 10.

Ibid. c. 11.

not be in his power, not to confirm it; if not, What do theſe moral means ſignifie? No more, than the *Crucifix Pope Innocent* ſhewed to *Monſieur de Saint-Amour*; *Before which,* he told him, *he kneeled down to take at the feet thereof his reſolution, according to the inſpiration given to him by the Holy Spirit, whoſe aſſiſtance was promiſed to him, and could not fail him.* We ſee, the *Pope* underſtood his *Infallibility* better, than to make uſe of ſuch moral means as *Councils* are; he knew his *Infallibility* came not that way, and therefore he took the more likely courſe to receive his *Inſpiration* from Heaven, by taking his reſolution at the feet of a *Crucifix.* And this he called, *his Council in matters of Faith:* And yet, if we believe him, he did as much want all *moral means* for finding out the *truth,* as another; ſince he ſo ingenuouſly confeſſed at another audience, *That he was old, and had never ſtudied Divinity.* But, What need he to do it, that could ſo eaſily be *inſpired,* by *kneeling at the feet of a Crucifix?* Your Doctrine then would not be very well taken at *Rome,* that *General Councils* are a *neceſſary Medium* to his *Holineſs,* in order to the definition of matters of Faith. No more would your following Diſtinction in vindication of *Stapleton, That though the Pope acquires no new power, or certainty of judgement by the preſence of a General Council, yet there is ſomething thereby, which conduceth to the due exerciſe of that power:* So that it muſt be an uſurpation or *undue exerciſe of power,* for the *Pope* to offer to define without a *General Council.* I know not what liberty you have to write theſe things among us; but if you were at *Rome,* you durſt not venture to do it. Your ſaying, that *Bellarmin* only ſayes, *That the firmneſs of a Council in regard of us, depends wholly on the Popes Confirmation,* argues, you had very little to ſay: For, What *firmneſs* hath a *Council* at all in this diſpute, but in regard of us; ſince you look on men as obliged to believe the Decrees of it *Infallible?* And if the Decrees had any *Infallibility* from the *Council,* that might make them firm in regard of us, as well as the *Pope.* But you object to your ſelf, *That if the Pope be Infallible without the Council, and the Council ſubject to errour without the Pope, it muſt needs follow, that all the Infallibility of General Councils proceeds from the Pope only; not partly from the Pope, and partly from the Council.* To which you anſwer, *That the aſſertors of that Opinion* (of whom you muſt be one, if you know what you ſay) *may ſay, that Chriſt hath made two promiſes to his Church, the one to aſſiſt her Soveraign Head and Paſtor to make him Infallible, another to aſſiſt General Councils to make them ſo.* But, What need this latter, if the former be well proved? For if the Head be *Infallible* by vertue of a *promiſe* from *Chriſt,* he muſt be Infallible, whether in *Council,* or out of it. And therefore it is a ridiculous ſhift to ſay, The *Pope* hath one promiſe to make him Infallible in a General Council; another to make him ſo out of it. But I commend you, that ſince you thought one would not hold, you would have two ſtrings for the Popes Infallibility. And it is but adding a third promiſe to the Church in general, and then your threefold cord may be ſurely Infallible.

Journal of Mr. *de Saint Amour.* part. 3. chap. 4. p. 78.

Journal. part 3. ch. 12. p. 120

P. 277.

Ibid.

§. 13. P. 278. You give many Reaſons (but none ſo convincing as Experience) *Why the Popes ſhould not be Impeccable*; and, if you ſearch Scripture, Antiquity, and Reaſon, you may find as much, why they ſhould not be *Infallible.* For that of the neceſſity of one, and not the other for the Church, is of your own deviſing, it having been ſufficiently proved, that the certainty of Faith doth not at all depend upon the *Popes,* or your *Churches,* or *Councils Infallibility.* And it ſeems ſtill very ſtrange to all who know the doctrine and promiſes of Chriſtianity, and that the promotion of *Holineſs* is the great deſign of it, and that *Faith* ſignifies nothing without *Obedience,* and that the *Spirit* of *God* is a *Spirit* of *Holineſs,* as well as Truth, that you dare challenge ſuch an aſſiſtance of the *Divine Spirit,* as may make your *Popes* Infallible, who have led lives quite contrary to the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt.* *Nay,*

ſuch

such lives, as his Lordship saith, *as no Epicurean Monster, storied out to the world, hath out-gone them in sensuality, or other gross impiety, if their own historians be true.* P. 263.

Your vindication of *Pope* Liberius *his submitting his judgement to* Athanasius, *because the Pope had passed no definition* ex Cathedrâ *in the business*, hath no strength at all, unless you first prove, that the *Popes definitions ex Cathedrâ*, were held *Infallible* then, which none would ever believe that read the passage, which his Lordship cites out of *Liberius his Epistle to Athanasius*. For, as he saith, The *Pope complemented exceeding low, that would submit his unerring judgement, to be commanded by* Athanasius, *who he well knew could err*. Whether S. *Ambrose* in his *Epistle* meddles with any *doctrinal definitions*, or only with some *difficulties* which that year happened about the *observation* of *Easter*, (the *fourteenth* of the *first month* falling on the *Lords day*) is not very material to our purpose. But that it was something else besides *Astronomical definitions* (which I know not what S. *Ambrose*'s excellency was in) might easily appear, if you had read the *Epistle*. So that you might have spared your large account of the *Paschal Letters* sent by the *Bishops* of *Alexandria* about the keeping of *Easter* (which are no great novelties to such, who are at all acquainted with *Antiquity*) and given us a fuller account, why in such a matter of *dispute* about the right of the day to be kept that year, the *Roman Bishops* should not rather have stood to the *Popes* definition, than write to S. *Ambrose*, if it had been then taken for granted, that the *Pope* was Infallible. But I might as well have passed by this testimony of S. *Ambrose*, as you do that of *Lyra*, which is so express for the Erring and *Apostatizing* of several *Popes*, that you thought the best Answer to it, were to let it alone. However you come off with the story of *Peter Lombard* (which is not of that consequence to require any further examination of the truth of it) I am sure you are hard put to it, in the case of *Honorius*; when you deny, *that* Honorius *did really maintain the Monothelites Heresie, and excuse the Councils Sentence, by saying, it was only in case of mis-information.* Since it manifestly appears by the *sixth Synod, action.* 13. that they condemned his *Epistle* written to *Sergius*, as containing heretical and pernicious Doctrine in it. And in the *seventh Synod* he is reckoned up with *Arrius, Macedonius, Eutyches, Dioscorus*, and the rest of condemned *Hereticks*, among whom he is likewise reckoned by *Leo* 2. in his Epistle to *Constantine*. Which evidence is so great, that *Canus* wonders at those who would offer to vindicate him. And, in the mean time, you provide excellent moral means for the *Pope* to judge of matters of Faith by, in *General Councils*, if they may be guilty of so *gross mis-information*, as you suppose here in the case of *Honorius*; and not one barely, but three successively, the *sixth, seventh*, and *eighth*, and the whole *Church* from their time, till *Albertus Pighius*, who first began to defend him. For conclusion of this point, *his Lordship would fain know* (*since this had been so plain, so easie a way, either to prevent all divisions about the Faith, or to end all Controversies, did they arise*) *why this brief, but most necessary proposition, The Bishop of* Rome *cannot err in his judicial determinations concerning Faith, is not to be found either in letter or sense, in any Scripture, in any Council, or in any Father of the Church, for the full space of a thousand years and more after Christ?* To this you answer, 1. *That in the sense wherein Catholicks maintain the Popes Infallibility to be a matter of necessary belief to all Christians it is found* (*for sense*) *both in Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, as you say you have proved, in proving the Infallibility of General Councils, of which he is the most principal and necessary member.* So then, when we enquire for the Infallibility of *General Councils*, we are sent to the *Pope* for his Confirmation to make them so; but when we enquire for the *Popes Infallibility*, P. 264. *Ambros. l.* 10. *ep.* 83. P. 280. *Action.* 8. *Synod.* 6. *Canus l.* 6. *Cap. ult.* P. 267. Ibid. Ibid.

Iibility, we are ſent back again to the *Councils*, for the proof of it. And they are hugely to blame, if they give not an ample teſtimony to the *Pope*, ſince he can do them as good a turn. But, between them both, we ſee the greateſt reaſon to believe neither the one, nor the other to be Infallible. But, 2. You would offer at ſomething too for his *perſonal Infallibility*; in which I highly commend your prudence, that you ſay, *You will omit Scripture*; and you might as well have omitted all that follows, ſince you ſay only, *That the teſtimonies you have produced, ſeem to do it in effect*; and at laſt ſay, *That it is an Aſſertion you have wholly declined the maintaining of, and judge it expedient to do ſo ſtill.* And you may very well do ſo, if there be no better proofs for it than thoſe you have produced, but however, we muſt examine them *Doth, not the Council of* Chalcedon *ſeem to ſay, in effect, that the Pope is Infallible, when, upon the reading of his Epiſtle to them, in condemnation of the Eutychian Hereſie, the whole Aſſembly of Prelates cry out with acclamation, and profeſs that S.* Peter (*who was Infallible*) *ſpake by the mouth of* Leo, *and that the Pope was interpreter of the Apoſtles voice?* You do well to uſe thoſe cautious expreſſions of *ſeeming to ſay in effect*, for it would be a very hard matter to imagine any ſuch thing as the *Popes* Infallibility in the higheſt expreſſions uſed by the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. For, after the reading of *Leo's Epiſtle* againſt *Eutyches*, and many teſtimonies of the *Fathers* to the ſame purpoſe, the *Council* begins their acclamations, with theſe words, *This is the Faith of the Fathers, this is the Faith of the Apoſtles; all who are orthodox hold thus.* And after it follows, *Peter by Leo hath thus ſpoken, the Apoſtles have taught thus.* Which are all the words there extant to that purpoſe. And, Is not this a ſtout argument, for the *Popes perſonal Infallibility?* For, What elſe do they mean, but only that *Leo*, who ſucceeded in the *Apoſtolical See* of S. *Peter* at *Rome*, did concur in Faith with S. *Peter*, and the reſt of the *Apoſtles?* But, Do they ſay, that it was impoſſible that *Leo* ſhould err, or that his judgement was *Infallible?* or only that he owned that Doctrine which was *Divine* and *Apoſtolical?* And the *Council* of *Epheſus* (your next teſtimony) hath much leſs than this, even nothing at all. For the *Council* ſpeaks not concerning S. *Peter*, or the *Pope* in the place by you cited; only one of the *Popes* officious *Legats*, *Philip*, begins very formally, with S. *Peter's being Prince and Head of the Apoſtles, &c. and that he to this day* ἐν τοῖς ἀυτῶ διαδόχοις ζῆ καὶ δικάζει; *lives in his ſucceſſors, and paſſeth judgement.* Is it not a very good Inference from hence, that the *Council* acknowledged the *Popes perſonal Infallibility?* becauſe one of the *Popes Legats* did aſſert in the *Council*, that S. *Peter lived and judged by the Pope.* And yet, Might not this be done without his perſonal *Infallibility*, in regard of his ſucceſſion in that *See* which was founded by S. *Peter?* But you are very hard driven, when you are fain to take up with the Sentence of a *Roman Prieſt*, inſtead of a *General Council*, and any *judgement* in matters of Faith, inſtead of *Infallibility*. Your other teſtimonies of S. *Hierom*, S. *Auguſtin*, and S. *Cyprian*, have been largely examined already; and for the remaining teſtimonies of four *Popes*, you juſtly *fear it would be anſwered, that they were Popes, and ſpake partially in their own cauſe.* And you give us no antidote againſt theſe fears; but conclude very warily, *That you had hitherto declined the defence of that Aſſertion, and profeſſed that it would be ſufficient for Proteſtants to acknowledge the Pope Infallible in, and with General Councils only.* But, as we ſee no reaſon to believe *General Councils* at all *Infallible*, whether with, or without the *Pope*; ſo neither can we ſee, but if the *Infallibility* of the *Council* depends on the *Popes* Confirmation, you are bound to defend the *Popes perſonal Infallibility*, as the main *Bulwark* of your *Church*.

Ibid.

Concil. Chalc. part. 2. Act. 2. p. 228.

Contil. Epheſ. p. 2. Act. 3. pag. 330.

P. 281.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the errors of pretended General Councils.

The erroneous Doctrine of the Church of Rome *in making the Priests intention necessary to the essence of Sacraments. That principle destructive to all certainty of Faith upon our Authors grounds. The absurdity of asserting that Councils define themselves to be Infallible. Sacramental actions sufficiently distinguished from others without the Priests Intention. Of the moral assurance of the Priests Intention, and the insufficiency of a meer virtual Intention. The Popes confirmation of Councils supposeth personal Infallibility. Transubstantiation an error decreed by Pope and Council. The repugnancy of it to the grounds of Faith. The Testimonies brought for it out of Antiquity examined at large, and shewed to be far from proving Transubstantiation. Communion in one kind a violation of Christs Institution. The Decree of the Council of* Constance *implyes a* non obstante *to it. The unalterable nature of Christs Institution cleared. The several evasions considered and answered. No publick Communion in one kind for a thousand years after Christ. The indispensableness of Christs Institution owned by the Primitive Church. Of Invocation of Saints, and the Rhetorical expressions of the Fathers which gave occasion to it. No footsteps of the Invocation of Saints in the three first Centuries; nor precept or example in Scripture as our Adversaries confess. Evidences against Invocation of Saints from the Christians Answers to the Heathens. The worship of Spirits and Heroes among the Heathens justifiable on the same grounds that Invocation of Saints is in the Church of* Rome. *Commemoration of the Saints without Invocation, in S.* Augustins *time. Invocation of Saints as practised in the Church of* Rome *a derogation to the merits of Christ. Of the worship of Images, and the near approach to Pagan Idolatry therein. No use or Veneration of Images in the Primitive Church. The Church of* Rome *justly chargeable with the abuses committed in the worship of Images.*

§. 1. ALthough nothing can be more unreasonable than to pretend that *Church, Person,* or *Council* to be *Infallible,* which we can prove to have actually erred; yet we have yielded so much to you, as to disprove what you have in general brought for the *one,* before we come to meddle with the *other.* But that being dispatched, we come to a more short and compendious way of overthrowing your *Infallibility,* by shewing the palpable falsity of such principles which must be owned by you as *Infallible* truths, because defined by *General Councils* confirmed by the *Pope.* Whereof, *the first in the Endictment,* as you say, *is that of the Priest Intention defined by the Councils of* Florence *and* Trent (*both of them confirmed by the Pope*) *to be essentially necessary to the validity of a Sacrament.* Concerning this, there are two things to be enquired into, 1. *Whether this doth not render all pretence of Infallibility with you a vain and useless thing?* 2. *Whether it be not in it self an error?* P. 281.

We must begin with the *first* of these, for that was the occasion of his Lordships entring upon it; for he was shewing, *That your claim of Infallibility is of no use at all, for the setling of Truth and Peace in the Church; because no man can either know or believe this Infallibility. It cannot be believed with Divine Faith; having no foundation either in the written Word of God, or Tradition of the Catholick Church; and no humane Faith can be sufficient in order to it. But neither can it be believed or known, upon that decree of the Councils of* Florence *and* Trent, *that the intention of the Priest is necessary to the validity of a Sacrament.* And lest you should think I P. 271.

repreſent his Lordſhips words too much with advantage, I will take his Argument in the words you have ſummed it up in, which are theſe: *Before the Church or any particular man can make uſe of the Popes Infallibility (that is, be ſetled, and confirmed in the Truth by means thereof), he muſt either know, or upon ſure grounds believe, that he is Infallible.* But (ſayes the Biſhop) *this can only be believed of him, as he is* S. Peters *Succeſſor and Biſhop of* Rome; *of which it is impoſſible, in the relators opinion, for the Church or any particular man, to have ſuch certainty as is ſufficient to ground an Infallible belief. Why? becauſe the knowledge and belief of this, depends upon his being truly in Orders, truly a Biſhop, truly a Prieſt, truly* Baptized; *none of all which, according to our principles, can be certainly known and believed; becauſe (forſooth) the intention of him that adminiſtred theſe Sacraments to the Pope, or made him Biſhop, Prieſt,* &c. *can never be certainly known; and yet by the Doctrine of the Councils of* Florence *and* Trent, *it is of abſolute neceſſity to the validity of every one of theſe Sacraments, ſo as without it, the Pope were neither Biſhop nor Prieſt.* Thus I grant you have faithfully ſumm'd up his Lordſhips Argument; we muſt now ſee with what courage and ſucceſs you encounter it. Your firſt Anſwer is, *That though it be level'd againſt the Popes Infallibility, yet it hath the ſame force againſt the Infallibility of the whole Church in points fundamental; for we cannot be Infallibly ſure, there is ſuch a number of Baptized perſons to make a Church.* By this we ſee how likely you are to aſſoil this difficulty, who bring it more ſtrongly upon your ſelf, without the leaſt inconvenience to your adverſary. For I grant, it neceſſarily follows againſt the pretence of any *Infallibility*, whether in *Church*, *Councils*, or *Pope*, as being a *certain ground* for *Faith*; for all theſe muſt ſuppoſe ſuch a *certainty* of the due *adminiſtration* of *Sacraments*, which your Doctrine of *Intention* doth utterly deſtroy. For theſe two things are your *principles* of *Faith*, that there can be no certainty of *Faith*, without preſent *Infallibility* of the *Church*; and that, in order to the believing this *teſtimony Infallible*, there muſt be ſuch a *certainty* as is ground ſufficient for an *Infallible belief*. Now, How is it poſſible there can be ſuch, when there can be no *certainty* of the *Being* of a *Church*, *Council*, or *Pope*, from your own principles? For when the only way of knowing this, is a thing not poſſible to be evidenced to any one in any way of *Infallible certainty*, viz. *the intention of the Prieſt*, you muſt unavoidably deſtroy all your pretence of *Infallibility*. For, To what purpoſe do you tell me, that *Pope* or *Councils* are *Infallible*, unleſs I may be *Infallibly ſure* that ſuch *decrees* were paſſed by *Pope* and *Council*? I cannot be aſſured of that, unleſs I be firſt aſſured that they were *Baptized perſons*, and *Biſhops* of the *Church*; and for this you dare not offer at *Infallible certainty*, and therefore all the reſt is uſeleſs and vain. So that while by this Doctrine of *the intention of the Prieſt for the validity of the Sacraments*, you thought to advance higher the reputation of the *Prieſthood*, and to take away the *aſſurance* of *Proteſtants*, as to the benefits which come by the uſe of the *Sacraments* of *Baptiſm* and the *Lords Supper*, you could not have aſſured any thing more really pernicious to your ſelves, than this *Doctrine* is. So ſtrange an *incogitancy* was it in thoſe *Councils* to define it, and as great in thoſe who defend it, and yet at the ſame time, maintain the neceſſity of a preſent *Infallibility* in the *Church* and *General Councils*. For can any thing be more *rational*, than to deſire the higheſt *aſſurance* as to that, whoſe *decrees* I am to believe *Infallible*? And yet at the laſt, you confeſs we can have but a *moral certainty* of it, and that of the loweſt degree; the utmoſt ground of it, being either the teſtimony of the *Prieſt* himſelf, or, that *we have no ground to ſuſpect the contrary*. Now what unreaſonable men are you, who ſo much to the diſhonour of *Chriſtian Religion* cry out upon the *rational evidence* of the *truth* of it, as an *uncertain principle*, and that *Proteſtants*

teſtants though they aſſert the higheſt degree of actual *certainty*, cannot have any *Divine Faith*, becauſe they want the *Churches Infallible teſtimony*? and yet when we enquire into this *Infallible Teſtimony*, you are fain to reſolve it, into one of the moſt *uncertain* and *conjectural* things imaginable. For what can I have leſs ground to build my Faith upon, than that the *Prieſt* had at leaſt a *virtual intention* to do as the *Church* doth? Whom muſt I believe in this caſe? and whereon muſt that *Faith* be grounded? On the *Prieſts Teſtimony*? But how can I be aſſured, but that he, who may wander in his *intention*, may do ſo in his *expreſſion* too? Or muſt I do it becauſe I have no *reaſon* to *ſuſpect* the contrary? how can you aſſure me of that, that I have no reaſon to ſuſpect the contrary? no otherwiſe than by telling me, that the *Prieſt* is a man of that *honeſty* and *integrity*, that he cannot be ſuppoſed to do ſuch a thing without *intention*? So that, though I were in *Italy* or *Spain*, where, ſome have told us, it is no hard matter to meet with *Jews* in *Prieſts habits*, and profeſſing themſelves ſuch, and acting accordingly; yet I am bound to believe (though they heartily believe nothing of *Chriſtianity*) that in all *Sacraments* they muſt have an *intention* to do as the *Church* doth. Without which, we are told by you, *No Sacrament can be valid, becauſe the matter and form cannot be determined or united without the Prieſts intention.* And therefore I do not only object, that this takes away the *comfort* of all *Sacraments* as to the *receivers*, but that it deſtroys all certain *Foundations of Faith*. Becauſe the promiſes of *Infallibility* ſuppoſing that, which I can have no *aſſurance* of; that *Infallibility* can be no foundation of *Faith* at all to me. As for inſtance, ſuppoſe the *title* to an *eſtate* depends upon the *Kings free donation*, and this *donation* to be confirmed by his *Great Seal*; but yet ſo, that if the *Lord Chancellor* in the *ſealing* it, doth not *intend* it ſhould paſs on that account, the whole *gift* becomes null in *Law*. I pray tell me now, What other *aſſurance* you can have of your *title* to this eſtate, than you have of the *Lord Chancellors intention* in paſſing the *Seal*? and what *Infallible certainty* you can have of ſuch *intention* of his? Juſt ſuch is your caſe, you tell us, The only ground of *Infallible certainty* in *Faith* is the *Churches Infallibility*, this *Infallibility* comes by a *free promiſe* of *Chriſt*, this *promiſe* muſt ſuppoſe a *Church* in being; that there is a *Church*, we can have no more *aſſurance* than that there are *Baptized-perſons*, but the validity of their *Baptiſm* requires the *Prieſts intention* in adminiſtring it; and therefore we can have no more *aſſurance* of the *Churches Infallibility*, than we have of the *Prieſts intention*. And, Is this it at laſt, which your loud clamours of *Infallibility* come to? Is this the effect of all your *exclamations* againſt *Proteſtants*, for making Faith *uncertain* by taking away the *Churches Infallibility*? Muſt our *Faith* at laſt be reſolved into that, which it is impoſſible we ſhould have any undoubted *aſſurance* at all of? And will not the higheſt reaſon, the cleareſt evidence, the moſt pregnant demonſtrations which things are capable of, be accounted with you *ſufficient ground* to build our *Faith* of the *Scriptures* upon? and yet, muſt a thing ſo *impoſſible* to be *certainly* known, ſo generally uncertain and conjectural, be accounted by you ſufficient ground to believe your *Churches Infallibility*? Are not the *miracles* wrought by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, joyned with the *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Chriſtian Church*, a ground firm enough, for us to believe the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt* divine? and yet muſt the *intention* of the *Prieſt* with you be a much ſurer ground than theſe are? By all which it appears, that if I had not already largely diſcovered your grand *Impoſture* in your pretence to *Infallibility*, this very Doctrine would invincibly prove it; ſince, notwithſtanding that pretence, you muſt reſolve all into ſomething which falls ſhort of thoſe grounds of *certainty* which we have to build our *Faith* upon. But we muſt now conſider, how you offer to

retort

retort this upon his Lordſhip; for you ſay, *The ſame Argument will hold againſt the Infallibility of the whole Church in Fundamentals; ſince men cannot be Infallibly ſure, there is ſuch a company of men who are truly Baptized.* But how manifeſtly ridiculous this is, will appear, 1. That it will hold indeed againſt all ſuch who aſſert this Doctrine of the *neceſſity* of the *Prieſts intention*, but not others. Therefore if his Lordſhip had ſaid, This Doctrine had been true, the retortion had been good; but you ſaw well enough he diſproves it as an *error*, and urges this as an abſurdity conſequent upon it. Your argument then as it is, runs in this form: If they who hold the *Prieſts* intention neceſſary cannot be *ſure* who are Baptized, then they who do not hold it neceſſary, cannot. Where is your conſequence? for he was ſhewing, the *uncertainty* of it depended upon that principle, and therefore I ſuppoſe the denying of the principle doth not ſtand guilty of the ſame abſurdity, which the holding it doth. But it may be, the force lyes in being *Infallibly ſure*, and ſo that none can know the Infallibility of the Church in *Fundamentals*, but ſuch as are *Infallibly ſure* that men are Baptiſed. I Anſwer therefore, 2. That there is no ſuch neceſſity of being *Infallibly ſure*, upon our principles as there is upon yours. For you build your *Faith* upon the *Churches Infallibility* in *Pope* and *Councils*, but we do not pretend to build our Faith upon the *Churches Infallibility* in *Fundamentals*. All that we aſſert, is, that the *Church* is Infallible in *Fundamentals*, but we do not ſay, the ground of our *Faith* is, becauſe ſhe is ſo, for that were to make the *Church* the *formal object* of our *Faith*: ſince therefore we do not rely on the *Church* as our *Infallible Guide* in *Fundamentals*, there is no ſuch neceſſity of that *Infallible certainty* as to this principle as there is with you, who muſt wholly eſtabliſh your Faith upon the *Churches* Infallibility. The moſt then that we aſſert, is, that there is and ſhall always be a *Church*, for that (as I have told you) is all that is meant by a *Church* being *Infallible* in *Fundamentals*; now for this we have the greateſt aſſurance poſſible, that there *ſhall be* from the promiſes of Chriſt, and that *there is*, from the certainty we have of the Faith and Baptiſm of *Chriſtians*, ſince no more is required by us to aſſure men of it, than all men in the world are competent *Judges* of; which ſurely they cannot be of the *Prieſts* intention. So much for your weak attempt of retorting this Argument upon his Lordſhip.

§. 2. Ibid. But the main thing to be conſidered, is, your ſolid Anſwer you give to it; which indeed is of that weight, that it muſt not be ſlightly paſſed over. You Anſwer therefore, *That both a General Council and the Pope, when they define any matters of Faith, do alſo implicitly define that themſelves are Infallible; and by conſequence that both the Pope in ſuch caſe, and alſo the Biſhops that ſit in Council are perſons Baptiſed, in holy Orders, and have all things eſſentially neceſſary for that Function, which they then execute. Neither is there any more difficulty in the caſe of the Pope now, than there was in the time of the Prophets and Apoſtles of old; whom all muſt grant that with the ſame breath they defined, or Infallibly declared the ſeveral Articles and points of Doctrine propoſed by them to the Faithful, and their own Infallibility in propoſing them.* So indeed *Vega* anſwered in the caſe of *General Councils*; for when it was demanded, How it ſhould be known that the *Council* was a lawful *Council*, he ſays, *Becauſe the Council defined it ſelf to be ſo*; but for this he is ſufficiently chaſtiſed by *Bellarmin*, who gives this unanſwerable Argument againſt it. Either it doth appear from ſome other Argument, that while the *Council* defines it ſelf to be a lawful *Council*, it was a lawful *Council*; or it doth not: if it doth, To what purpoſe doth it define it ſelf to be a lawful *Council*? if it doth not, then we ſhall doubt of that Decree whereby it defines it ſelf to be ſo: for if I doubt, whether the *Council* were lawful before that Decree; I doubt likewiſe, whether it might not err

De Concil. l. 2. c. 9.

in

in paſſing that Decree. And therefore he grants, that no more than *moral certainty* or hiſtorical Faith is requiſite in order to it. Now this Argument of *Bellarmins* holds with equal ſtrength (if not more) againſt you; for you derive the lawfulneſs of the *Council* from its *Infallibility*, and that *Infallibility* from the *Councils* definition. Thus therefore I argue: Either it doth appear, that the *Council* was *Infallible* before that definition, or it doth not. If it appears to be *Infallible* before, then its *Infallibility* is not known by that *definition*: If it doth not, How can I know it to be *Infallible* by it? For as I doubt, whether it was *Infallible* before it, ſo I muſt doubt, whether it was *Infallible* in it: and conſequently it is impoſſible I ſhould believe it *Infallible* becauſe it defines it ſelf to be ſo. Neither do you at all ſalve this, by calling it only an *implicite definition*, for whether it be *implicite* or *explicite*, it is all one, ſince that *definition* is made the ground, why we muſt believe the *Council* to be Infallible. And of all men in the world you ſeem the ſtrangeſt in this, that you declaim with ſo much vehemency againſt thoſe who believe the *Scriptures* to be *Infallible for themſelves*; and yet aſſert that *Pope* and *General Councils* are to be believed *Infallible*, *becauſe they define themſelves to be ſo.* Than which no greater abſurdity can be well imagined. For they who aſſert that the *Scriptures* are to be believed for *themſelves*, do not thereby mean that they are to be believed *Infallible* meerly becauſe they ſay they are *Infallible*, but that out of the *Scriptures* ſuch *Arguments* may be brought, as may ſufficiently prove that they come from *God*. But when you ſay, that *Pope and General Councils* are to be believed *Infallible*. becauſe of their *implicite definition* that they are ſo, you can mean nothing elſe, but that they are *Infallible*, becauſe they take upon them to be *Infallible*, for that is all I can underſtand by your *implicit definition*; for if they ſhould decree they were Infallible, that were an *explicit definition.* But yet how ſhould this *implicit definition* be known? for it muſt be ſome way certainly known, or elſe we can never believe that they are *Infallible* upon that account. Which way then muſt we underſtand that they *implicitly* define it? Is it by their meeting, debating, decreeing matters of *Faith?* that cannot be, for *Councils* have done all theſe which are acknowledged to have *erred.* Is it by *Pope* and *Council* joyning together? but how can that be, unleſs I know before, that, when *Pope* and *Council* joyn, they are *Infallible?* If this then be all the way to prove that *Pope* and *Council* are *true Biſhops* becauſe *Infallible*, and they are *Infallible* becauſe they *define* themſelves to be ſo; I ſee, there is an abſolute neceſſity of a mans putting out the *eye* of his reaſon, if ever he hopes to *ſee Pope* and *Councils Infallible.* But further yet, there is more abſurdity ſtill (if more can be imagin'd) in this excellent Anſwer; for here is a new *Labyrinth* for our Author to ſport himſelf in. For, we are to believe a *Council* to conſiſt of lawful *Biſhops* becauſe they are *Infallible*, and yet his only way to prove them *Infallible*, is by ſuppoſing that they conſiſt of lawful *Biſhops*. For I ask, Whether all perſons meeting together in *Council* are Infallible? *No.* Are all *Biſhops* of *Proteſtant*, and the *Greek*, and other *Churches* beſides the *Roman*, aſſembled in *Council* Infallible? *No.* Muſt it not then be ſuppoſed, that the *Biſhops* are lawful *Biſhops*, before they can *implicitly* define themſelves Infallible? And if their lawfulneſs muſt be ſuppoſed before their *Infallibility*, they cannot firſt be proved to be Infallible, before we can know, Whether they were lawful *Biſhops* or no. And we cannot know them to be lawful *Biſhops*, unleſs we knew the *intention* of the *Prieſt*; and therefore it remains proved with evidence equal to a *demonſtration*, that your *certainty* of your *Churches* Infallibility, can be no greater than that you have of the *Prieſts* intention in the adminiſtration of *Sacraments.*

And

And by this it appears, how abſurdly you go about *to compare the caſe of Pope and Council, with that of the Prophets and Apoſtles of old.* For you challenge not an *Infallibility* by *immediate inſpiration*, but ſuch as is conſtantly reſident in the *Church*, by vertue of ſome particular *promiſes*, which muſt ſuppoſe the *perſons* in whom it lodges to be actually *members* of the *Church*. And therefore all the proof of their *Infallibility* depends upon the *certainty* of that, which you can never ſatisfie any rational men in; but, I hope, you will not ſay, it was ſo in the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*. Beſides, *God* never ſent any perſons with a meſſage from himſelf to the world, but he gave the world ſufficient evidence in point of reaſon that He ſent them; either by *Miracles*, the *Teſtimony* of other *Prophets* who wrought them, or ſome other ſatisfactory way to humane reaſon, as I have elſewhere proved at large. But there is no ſuch thing in your caſe, no rational evidence at all is offered, but we muſt believe the *Council* lawful becauſe *Infallible*, and we muſt believe it *Infallible* becauſe it defines it ſelf to be ſo. Neither is it poſſible to conceive that any man ſhould believe whatever the *Prophet* or *Apoſtle* ſaid, to be *Infallibly true*; unleſs he were before convinced, that they were *Infallible* who ſpake it. But for this you have a further Anſwer, *That it is not neceſſary to believe the Infallibility of the propoſer*, viz. prioritate temporis, *in reſpect of time, and afterwards the Infallibility of the Doctrine he propoſeth: but it ſufficeth to believe it firſt* prioritate naturæ, *ſo as the Infallibility of the teacher be preſuppoſed to the Infallibility of his Doctrine.* But what this makes to your purpoſe, I underſtand not. For it is not the *time*, but the evidence we enquire for, or the *ground* on which we are to believe the propoſer *Infallible*. Whether it muſt not be ſomething elſe beſides the *implicite defining* himſelf to be *Infallible?* You aſſert that to be a ſufficient ground in the caſe of *Pope* and *Councils*; and I pray, Will it not be as ſufficient in the caſe of a *Quaker*, or *Enthuſiaſt?* May not they as well pretend this, that they are *Infallible?* and if you ask them what evidence they have for it, they may tell you, juſt the ſame that *Pope* and *Council* have to be ſo: for, as they *implicitely define themſelves to be Infallible, ſo do they.* So that, talk what you will of *private Spirits* and *Enthuſiaſms*, I know none lay ſo great a foundation for them as you do upon this pretence; *That we are to believe the Pope and Council Infallible, becauſe implicitly they define themſelves to be ſo.* Than which, one could hardly meet with a more abſurd Anſwer from the higheſt *Enthuſiaſt*: for, he can tell you as boldly, that he hath the *Spirit* of *God*, becauſe he hath it; and juſt ſo much you ſay, and no more, *Pope and Council are Infallible, becauſe they are Infallible.* But I muſt pity you: I know you would not willingly have run into theſe *abſurdities*, but it was your hard fortune to maintain a bad cauſe, and you could not poſſibly help it; for the *ſtraights* you were in, were ſo great, that you muſt venture thorow ſome great *abſurdity* to get out of them. But all the pity I have for you is gone, when I read your next words. *Thus we conceive the Relator's* Achilles *is fallen.* How fallen? If he be, it is only with *Antæus*, to riſe the ſtronger. But I aſſure you, ſo far was he from falling by any force of your Anſwer, that he ſtands more impregnably than ever, having not ſo much as a *heel* left, that you can wound him in. And if you have nothing more to ſay, than what you here give us in anſwer to this argument, which you tell us, *is the common Anſwer of Divines*; I am ſo far from wondring that his Lordſhip took no notice of it, that I ſhall only wonder at the weakneſs of your judgement, or largeneſs of your Faith, that can ſo contentedly ſwallow ſuch grand *abſurdities*.

§. 3. P. 283. *If this be but*, as you ſay, *the Prologue to the Play*, I doubt you will find but a ſad *Cataſtrophe* in it: *The main buſineſs*, you tell us, *is about the Prieſts intention, concerning which he poſitively layes down, that it is not of abſolute neceſſity to the eſſence of a Sacrament, ſo as to make it void, though the Prieſts thoughts*

thoughts ſhould wander from his work, at the inſtant of uſing the eſſentials of a Sacrament ; yea, or have in him an actual intention to ſcorn the Church. What now have you to ſhew to the contrary? *If the Prieſts intention be not abſolutely neceſſary to the eſſence or validity of a Sacrament, you deſire a reaſon of your adverſaries, Why we ſhould not think a Prieſt conſecrates the body of Chriſt, as much at a Table where there is Wheaten Bread before him, and that either by way of diſputation, or reading the 26 Chapter of St.* Matthew, *he pronounces the words,* Hoc eſt corpus meum, *as he doth at the Altar ; ſince here is the true form,* Hoc eſt corpus meum, *the true matter Wheaten Bread, and he that pronounces the form, is a true Prieſt, and yet in all mens judgement here's no true Sacrament made. Something elſe therefore is requiſite to the eſſence of a Sacrament, and, What can that poſſibly be, if it be not the intention which the Church requires?* Since your requeſt is reaſonable, I ſhall endeavour your ſatisfaction, and the rather becauſe it tends to the full clearing the buſineſs in hand. To your Enquiry then, I anſwer, That the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* requiring ſuch a *ſolemnity* for the adminiſtration of it, and ſuch a *diſpoſition* in the *Church* for the receiving it, and the performance of ſuch *acts*, in order to the adminiſtration, by the *diſpenſer* of it; theſe do ſufficiently diſtinguiſh the *Lords Supper* from all other actions, what matter, form, or perſon ſoever be there. Were not in the *Apoſtles* times the aſſembling of the people together for this end, and the ſolemn performance of the *acts* of *adminiſtration*, ſufficient to diſcriminate the *Lords Supper*, from reading the 26 of *Matthew*, by an *Apoſtle* at the Table, when there was *Bread* and *Wine* upon it? And I muſt confeſs, I cannot but wonder that you ſhould be ſo much to ſeek, as not to know the one from the other, unleſs you knew the *Prieſts intention?* But I conſider, your Queſtion was not made for *Apoſtolical times*, but for *private Maſſes*, wherein the *Prieſt* may mumble over the words of *Conſecration* to himſelf, and none elſe be the wiſer or better for what he ſaith, or doth. Here it was indeed very requiſite you ſhould make the *Prieſts intention* neceſſary to *diſcriminate* this action, from that you mentioned; but, where-ever the *Lords Supper* is duly adminiſtred according to the *Primitive Inſtitution*, the ſolemnity of the action and circumſtances do ſo far individuate it, as ſufficiently to difference it from any other *formalities* whatſoever. And ſo it is in *conferring Orders* ; Is there not enough, do you think, in the *ſolemnity* of the action, with the preceding *circumſtances*, and the *Biſhops* laying on of his *hands*, with the uſing the words proper to that occaſion, to difference it from the *Biſhops* caſual laying his hands on the head of a man, and in the mean time reading perchance the *words* of *ordination?* We aſſert then, that no further *intention* is at all *neceſſary* to the eſſence of a *Sacrament*, but what is diſcoverable by the outward action. Which being of that nature, which may difference it ſelf by reaſon of peculiar *circumſtances* from others, there is no imaginable neceſſity to have recourſe to the private *intention* of the *Prieſt* for ſatisfaction. But ſee how unreaſonable you are herein; for you would make that to be neceſſary to diſtinguiſh a *Sacramental action* from any other, which it is impoſſible any man ſhould be acquainted with. For, if I had no other way to diſtinguiſh in the caſe you mention, but the *Prieſts intention*, I muſt be as much to ſeek as ever, unleſs I certainly knew what the *Prieſts intention* was; which if you have an art of being acquainted with, I pretend not to it. Is it then neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the one from the other, or not? If not, To what end is your Queſtion? If it be, To what purpoſe is the *Prieſts intention*, when I cannot know it? But you would ſeem to object againſt the *circumſtances* diſcriminating a *Sacramental action*. 1. *If the circumſtances do ſhew to the ſtanders by, that the Prieſt really intends to make a Sacrament, and this ſignification be neceſſary? then the Prieſts in-*

tention is neceſſary, or elſe, Why is it neceſſary it ſhould be ſignified? I anſwer, The circumſtances are not intended to ſignifie the *Prieſts intention* any further, than that *intention* is diſcoverable by the *actions* themſelves, ſo that it is not any *inward intention* which is thereby ſignified, but only ſuch an *intention* as the *outward action* imports, which is the celebration of the *bleſſed Sacrament*. So it is not the *Prieſts* intending *to make a Sacrament*, as you phraſifie it, but his intending *to celebrate it*, *i.e.* not ſuch an *intention* as is *unitive* of *matter* and *form*, as your *Schools* ſpeak in this caſe, but ſuch as relates to the *external action*. But againſt this you urge, 2. *That ſuch external ſignification is not at all neceſſary; for*, ſay you, *Might not a Catholick Prieſt, to ſave the ſoul of ſome dying Infant, baptize it, if he could, without any ſuch ſignification by circumſtances?* Yes, and a very charitable man he would be in it too, if without any *ſignification* by *circumſtances*, *he could ſave the ſoul of a dying Infant*. But I ſhould think his meer intention were ſufficient, and that the *chief Prieſt* would ſupply the reſt, as the *Schools* determine in a like caſe. For they put a very hard Queſtion to themſelves, *If the intention of a Prieſt be neceſſary to the validity of a Sacrament, then, What becomes of the ſoul of an Infant, which dyes, being baptized without the Prieſt's intention?* To which they anſwer, *It may very piouſly be believed, that in that caſe,* ſummus Sacerdos ſupplebit, *the High Prieſt will ſupply that defect*; and what they ſay of *intention*, is much more true of *Baptiſm* it ſelf; for in caſe it be not done out of *contempt*, I ſay that *ſummus Sacerdos ſupplebit*: it is not the meer want of *Baptiſm* will damn the ſoul of the *Infant*, (as you ſuppoſe) when you make it ſo neceſſary, to uſe ſuch *ſhifts* as you ſpeak of, *to ſave the ſoul of a dying Infant*. But, Do you think ſeriouſly, that is the way to do it; for *a Prieſt, under a Phyſical pretence to ſprinkle water on the Childs face often, and once among the reſt, to ſay ſoftly, or by way of diſcourſe*, Ego te baptizo, &c. *with intention to conferr the Sacrament?* But you ask however, *Whether the Child be not really baptized by this, although none took notice of what the Prieſt did?* I anſwer, though we ſhould grant it, yet it proves not that the *Prieſts inward intention* was it which made it a *Sacrament*; but the obſervation of the *inſtitution* of Chriſt in the external actions; and ſo far, as that is obſerved in this *odd kind* of *baptizing*, ſo far it is *Baptiſm*, and no more. There are two things therefore to be obſerved in *Sacramental actions*. 1. The *differencing* of them from other *common* or *ordinary actions*, and this we ſay is done by the *circumſtances* attending them. 2. The *validity* of them as *Sacraments*, and this depends wholly and only on the obſervation of *Chriſts inſtitution*. For, as it is *Inſtitution* which makes a *Sacrament*, ſo it is the obſervation of it, which makes this a *Sacramental action*, and not another. But in neither caſe is the *Prieſts intention* neceſſary to the eſſence of a *Sacrament*; for it may have its full force in all reſpects it was appointed for, whatever the *Prieſts* inward intention be. So that neither of your Inſtances, as to the *Sacraments* of *Baptiſm*, or the *Euchariſt*, do at all imply the neceſſity of the *Prieſts intention*, in order to the eſſence of a *Sacrament*, in either of them.

Alexand. Alenſis part 4. quæſt. 8. memb. 3. art. 1. ſect. 1. Reo ſine præjudicio, &c. Bonaventur. c. 4. di. 6. art. 2. quæſt. 1. ad fin.

§. 4. P. 284. As for the inconvenience which, you ſay, *the Biſhop pretends would follow out of this Doctrine*, viz. *that no man can reſt ſecure that he hath been really made partaker of any Sacrament, no not of Baptiſm it ſelf.* You anſwer, 1. *That as to the far greater part of Chriſtians, the inconvenience follows as much out of the Biſhops principles as yours, that they cannot be abſolutely certain that they are baptized? becauſe the Prieſt may vitiate ſomething pertaining to the eſſentials of Baptiſm.* 2. You anſwer, *That moral Aſſurance is ſufficient in ſuch caſes*, i. e. *ſuch as is liable to no juſt cauſe of doubting and ſuſpecting the contrary.* We accept of this latter Anſwer in reference to your retortion of the *inconvenience* upon us, as to which we ſay, That where is no

ſufficient

ſufficient cauſe of doubting, a man ought to reſt ſatisfied. But I ſhall now ſhew you, that this *moral aſſurance* cannot be ſufficient in your caſe, and that for theſe Reaſons, 1. Becauſe you build a main principle of *Faith* upon it, and you ſay, *That moral Aſſurance cannot be a ſufficient foundation for Faith*; for then all your diſcourſe of the *reſolution of Faith*, comes to nothing, which runs upon this principle, *That nothing ſhort of Infallibility can be a ſufficient foundation for Faith.* Now that you build a principle of *Faith* upon it, is evident, as I have proved already, even all that *Infallibility* you pretend to in *Church*, *Pope*, and *Council*; for all depends upon this, that you certainly know, that ſuch perſons in your *Church* have had the *Sacrament* of *Baptiſm* truly adminiſtred, which cannot be without knowing the *Prieſts intention.* 2. Becauſe you acknowledged before, that there muſt be ſuch a *certainty* as is ſufficient to ground an *Infallible belief*; for this you placed in his Lordſhips Objection, and this you pretended to ſatisfie, by ſaying, *That the Pope and Council implicitly define themſelves to be Infallible*; and therefore you fall much beneath your ſelf now, when you ſay, *Moral Aſſurance* is ſufficient. 3. Becauſe we have far greater ground for *moral Aſſurance* than you: for we make no more requiſite to the *eſſence* of a *Sacrament*, than what all men are competent judges of; and our *Church* allows no ſuch *Baptiſms*, wherein none but the *Prieſt* is preſent; therefore if he *vitiates* any thing *eſſential* to *Baptiſm*, it may eaſily be diſcovered; but in your caſe you have no poſitive *Aſſurance* at all of the *Prieſts intention*, the utmoſt you can pretend to, is, your having no *ground* to ſuſpect it, which in many caſes there may be. So that you cannot have properly a *moral Certainty*, which hath ſome evidence to build it ſelf upon; but in your caſe there can be no *evidence* at all of the *Prieſts intention*, and therefore the knowledge of it is uncertain and conjectural. So that there is a vaſt difference between that *moral Aſſurance*, which we may have from the *external action*, and that which you can poſſibly have from the *Prieſts intention.* 4. The danger is far greater, in not having this *Aſſurance* upon your principles, than upon ours, and yet we have far greater *Aſſurance* than you can poſſibly pretend to. Your danger is manifeſtly greater, as appears by this evident demonſtration of it, *viz.* that in caſe the *Prieſts intention* be wanting, you muſt, by your own confeſſion, be guilty of *groſs Idolatry*; and yet you cannot certainly know, what the *Prieſts intention* was. This is plain in the caſe of the *Euchariſt*, whoſe *adoration* you profeſs to be *lawful*, becauſe you ſuppoſe *Chriſt* to be preſent there. Now this depends upon a thing impoſſible for you certainly to know, and that is the *Prieſts intention* in the *Conſecration.* For if the *Prieſt* wanted that *inward intention* which you make neceſſary to the eſſence of a *Sacrament*, then, for all his pronouncing the words of *Conſecration*, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, *Chriſts body* may not be there; and in caſe it be not there, you are by your own confeſſion guilty of *Idolatry*, for you do not then worſhip *Chriſt*, but meerly the *Bread.* Therefore, ſuppoſing *adoration* of the *Euchariſt* upon your principle of *Tranſubſtantiation* were not *Idolatry*, yet ſince that depends upon a thing *impoſſible* to be *known*, Who can with a good conſcience do that, which he cannot be certain, but in the doing it, he may commit the *greateſt Idolatry?* Wherefore, all the ill conſequences of this Doctrine of the *intention* of the *Prieſt* conſidered, beſides the palpable errours of it, never was any Doctrine more imprudently contrived, or more weakly managed, than when this was decreed at the *Councils* of *Florence* and *Trent.*

You ſpend many words to explain that *virtual intention* which the *Schools* have taken up from *Scotus* upon this ſubject; but, all that you ſay, adds nothing of ſatisfaction: upon theſe grounds, 1. Becauſe this *virtual intention* muſt ſuppoſe ſome *actual intention*, ſo it is in all thoſe caſes you men- §. 5. P. 284 &c.

tion *of a ſervant on his journey, a labourer at his work*; though theſe may not have alwayes an *expreſs intention* of the deſign of their journey or labour, yet there is ſufficient evidence from both of them, to know they had an *actual intention*, and there is no neceſſity of knowing any more of it, than what their *actions* diſcover: but in your caſe it is neceſſary to know that there was once an *actual intention*, becauſe upon that depends the *eſſence* of the *Sacrament*: and that is it which we object againſt you, that you cannot have any aſſurance that the Prieſt ever had an *expreſs intention*. We do not therefore ſay, that any wandring thoughts after, do deſtroy the *eſſence* of a *Sacrament*; but the want of an *actual intention* at all upon your principles doth it, and this you cannot be certain of upon your grounds. And therefore your *virtual intention* doth you no ſervice at all; for you ſay, *This virtual intention is, when the Prieſt doth really operate, or celebrate the Sacrament in virtue of an expreſs intention which he had to do it*; therefore it neceſſarily follows, that the *eſſence* and *validity* of the *Sacrament* muſt depend upon the firſt *expreſs intention*, and not the after virtual one. So that if you cannot be certain of the *firſt actual intention*, the *Sacrament* may want its eſſence, for all that you know. 2. Though a *virtual intention* may be conſiſtent with ſome *wandring thoughts* from the *firſt intention*, yet not with an *expreſs intention* to the *contrary*. As in your own inſtance, A ſervant ſent upon buſineſs, hath at firſt an *expreſs intention*, to do what his Maſter commands him; after, falling into company upon his way, he loſeth for the time his *actual intention*; but, as long as he goes on upon his firſt buſineſs, he retains, I grant, a *virtual intention* of it: but, ſuppoſing that company diſſwade him from it, or his own mind turn, ſo that he hath an *actual intention* to the contrary, Will you ſay, this man retains his *virtual intention* ſtill? Now our argument doth not lye meerly in this, that the *Prieſt*, at the inſtant of *Conſecration*, may have his mind diſtracted from the matter, in which caſe you ſay, *The virtual intention* remains ſtill, and is ſufficient; but, that you cannot have any *certainty*, but he may have an *actual* and *expreſs intention* to the *contrary*, at the inſtant of *Conſecration*, and this deſtroyes his *virtual intention*, and conſequently the eſſence of the *Sacrament*. For, as long as you require an *inward intention*, beſides the *external action*, you muſt be aſſured, that he had no actual contrary *intention* at that time, or elſe your *virtual intention* ſignifies nothing to your purpoſe or ſatisfaction. That
P. 273. which remains, is concerning *Catharinus*, of whom his Lordſhip ſayes, *That being preſent at* Trent, *he diſputed this caſe very learnedly, and made it moſt evident, that this Opinion cannot be defended, but that it muſt open a way for any unworthy Prieſt, to make infinite nullities in the adminiſtration of Sacraments; and that his arguments were of ſuch ſtrength, as amazed the other Divines which were preſent. And concluded, that no internal intention was required in the Miniſter of a Sacrament, but that intention which did appear*, opere externo, *in the work it ſelf performed by him; and that if he had unworthily any wandring thoughts; nay more, any contrary intention within him, yet it neither did,*
P. 285. *nor could hinder the bleſſed effect of any Sacrament.* To this you anſwer, *That the Cardinal* Palavicino *is clear of opinion, that the Council decreed nothing againſt him; becauſe he denied not an intention to be neceſſary in the Sacrament, but only explicated the thing differently from the common way of the Schoolmen.* But whoſoever will read the arguments which *Catharinus* uſed in the *Council* of *Trent* againſt the *Prieſts intention*, will eaſily find that he diſputes againſt all manner of *inward intention*, but ſuch as may be diſcovered by the external action. But we muſt conſider that *Palavicino* had a particular kindneſs for *Catharinus*, as being of *Siena* (the preſent *Popes* Country) inſomuch that *Ceſar Aquilinius* ſaith, *If* Luther *had been of* Siena, *the Cardinal* Palavicino *would have defended him*: and thence he endeavours

endeavours to vindicate him in the point of certitude of *Grace*, as well as in this of the *Prieſts intention*, though in both, he goes contrary to the general ſenſe of your *Divines*, both then at *Trent*, and ever ſince; who looked on both Opinions of *Catharinus*, as condemned there, as is manifeſt by *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, *Vaſquez*, *Valentia*, and others. But however, we may obſerve this from hence, What an excellent Rule of *Faith*, and Judge of Controverſies the Decrees of your *Council* of *Trent* are, when there have been, and are ſtill, ſuch different Opinions, and eager conteſts about the ſenſe of them; that in one point *Dominicus à Soto* ſaith, the *Council* decreed of his ſide, *Catharinus* ſaith juſt the contrary, and yet both great *Divines* and preſent in the *Council*. And in this Doctrine of the *intention* of the *Prieſt*, the general apprehenſion then was, and hath been ſince, that *Catharinus* his Opinion was condemned there, but *Cardinal Palavicino* undertakes to prove the contrary. So that in the mean time here is like to be a fair *end* of Controverſies, by your pretended Infallible Decrees of *Councils*, when you are ſo far from being agreed, what the ſenſe of them is: and yet *You*, *You* are the men who ſay, *Controverſies* cannot be ended by the *Scripture*, becauſe there are ſuch differences in the ſenſe and interpretation of it. Thus (we hope) we have ſufficiently vindicated his Lordſhips firſt charge of errour againſt your pretended *General Councils* confirmed by the *Pope*.

Before we come to the ſecond, you ſay, *His Lordſhip preſents ſuch a quaint ſubtilty againſt the Popes right to confirm them, and the neceſſity of his Confirmation, that you cannot well avoid the taking notice of it.* §. 6. P. 258. Thus then, you ſay, he argues, *No Council is confirmed till it be finiſhed: and when it is finiſhed, even before the Popes Confirmation be put to it, either it hath erred, or it hath not erred: If it hath erred, the Pope ought not to confirm it; and if he do, it is a void act: for no power can make falſhood truth: If it hath not erred, then it was true before the Pope confirmed it; ſo his Confirmation adds nothing but his own aſſent.* As quaint a *ſubtilty* as you call this, I am ſure you are hard put to it, to return any ſatisfactory Anſwer to it. For you diſtinguiſh *of the Popes joynt-conſent, and of his actual Confirmation; in caſe*, ſay you, *the Pope either in perſon, or by his Legats concurr with the Council, then the definition is unqueſtionably Infallible; but in caſe he doth not, then the actual Confirmation is neceſſary; but in caſe the Council err, the Pope ought not, and it is impoſſible he ſhould confirm it; but if he doth not err, you grant it is true, before the Pope confirms it, but his Confirmation makes us infallibly certain that it is true.* This is the full force of your Anſwer, which by no means takes off the difficulty, as will appear, 1. That by reaſon of the *Pope*'s rare appearance in *General Councils* (never in any that are unqueſtioned by the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*) that of his *joynt-conſent* cannot ſerve you: neither doth the preſence of his *Legats* ſuffice; for it is determined by *Bellarmin*, and proved by many reaſons, that though the *Pope*'s *Legats* conſent, yet if they have not the *expreſs ſentence* of the *Pope*, the *Council* may err notwithſtanding. *De Concil. l. 2. c. 11.* So that ſtill the *Popes* actual Confirmation is ſuppoſed neceſſary, and that after the definitions of the *Council* are paſſed. And this is the caſe which his Lordſhip ſpeaks to: and for your anſwer to that, I ſay, 2. That in plain terms you aſſert the *Popes perſonal Infallibility*, which you diſowned the defence of before: for you ſay, In caſe the *Council err*, not only the *Pope* ought not to confirm it, but that it is impoſſible he ſhould. Which, What is it other than to aſſert, that the *Pope* ſhall never err, though the *Council* may? Neither is it ſufficient to ſay, *That he ſhall never err in confirming the Decrees of a Council:* for in this caſe the *Council* is ſuppoſed actually to *err* already, ſo that nothing of *Infallibility* can be at all ſuppoſed in the *Council*; and if the *Pope* be not conſidered in his perſonal capacity, he might err as well as the *Council*.

Council. From whence it follows, ſince you ſuppoſe that a *Council* may err, but not the *Pope*, that you really judge the *Council* not to be Infallible, but the *Pope* only. 3. When you ſay, That if the *Council* erred not, the *Popes* Confirmation doth not make the definition true, but makes us infallibly certain that it is true. I enquire further, Whereon this *Infallible Certainty* depends? on a *promiſe* made to the *Council*, or to the *Pope*? Not to the *Council*, for that you grant may err; but it is impoſſible the *Pope* ſhould confirm it, therefore ſtill it is ſome promiſe of the *Popes Infallibility* which makes men *Infallibly certain* of the truth of what the *Council* decrees. 4. To what purpoſe then are all thoſe *promiſes* and *proofs* of *Scripture* which you produced concerning the *Councils Infallibility*, if, notwithſtanding them, a *General Council may err?* Only the *Pope* ſhall never confirm it, and although it do not err, yet we cannot be *Infallibly certain* of it, but by the *Popes* confirmation. And let any reaſonable man judge, whether a promiſe of the *Popes Infallibility*, though there be none at all concerning *Councils*, be not ſufficient for all this? So that upon theſe principles you take away the leaſt degree of *neceſſity* of any *Infallibility* in *Councils*, and reſolve all into the *Popes* Infallibility. For to what purpoſe are they *Infallible*, if we cannot be certain that any thing which they *decree* is true, but by the *Popes* confirmation?

§. 7. But that the *Popes confirmation* cannot make the Decrees of thoſe you account *General Councils* Infallible, nor us *Infallibly certain* of the truth of them, his Lordſhip proves by another evidence in matter of fact, *viz. That*

P. 257. *the Pope hath erred by teaching in and by the Council of* Lateran (*confirmed by* Innocent 3.) *that Chriſt is preſent in the Sacrament by way of Tranſubſtantiation. Which* (his Lordſhip ſaith) *was never heard of in the Primitive Church, nor till the Council of* Lateran; *nor can it be proved out of Scripture; and taken properly cannot ſtand with the grounds of Chriſtian Religion.* This

P. 287. you call *a ſtrange kind of proceeding to aſſert a point of ſo great importance, without ſolving or ſo much as taking notice of the pregnant proofs your Authors bring both out of Scripture and Fathers to the contrary of what he mainly affirms.* How pregnant thoſe proofs are, we muſt examine afterwards; but his Lordſhip might juſtly leave it to thoſe who aſſert ſo ſtrange a Doctrine to produce their evidence for it. Eſpecially, ſince it is confeſſed by ſo many among your ſelves, *That it could not be ſufficiently proved, either from Scripture or Fathers to bind men to the belief of it, till the Church had defined it in the Council of* Lateran: Since, *the more moderate and learned men among your ſelves* (*Biſhop* Tonſtall *for one*) *have looked on that definition as a raſh and inconſiderate action.* Since, *the Engliſh Jeſuits confeſſed, that the Fathers did not meddle with the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.* Since, Suarez *confeſſeth that the names uſed by the Fathers, are more accommodated to an accidental change.* Since, *Father* Barns *acknowledgeth that Tranſubſtantiation is not the Faith of the Church, and that Scripture and Fathers may be ſufficiently expounded of a Supernatural preſence of the body of Chriſt without any change in the ſubſtance of the Elements.* For which he produces a large *Catalogue* of *Fathers* and others. Since therefore we have ſuch confeſſions of your own ſide, What need his Lordſhip (in a Controverſie ſo throughly ſifted as this hath been) bring all the *Teſtimonies* of both ſides which had been ſo often and ſo punctually examin'd by others? *At laſt* (you ſay) *he ſhould have cleared how Tranſubſtantiation may be taken improperly, whereas of all the words which the Church uſeth, there is none methinks leſs apt to a Metaphorical and figurative ſenſe, than this of Tranſubſtantiation.*

Scotus in 4. ſent. diſt. 11. q. 3.
Gabr. Biel in Canon. Miſſæ. lect. 40.
Fiſher contr. captivit. Babyl. c. 9. p. 99.
Cajetan. in 3. Qu. 75. A. 1.
Petrus de Alliaco in 4. ſent. q. 6.
Tonſtall de verit. corp Chriſti, &c. p. 46.
Eraſmus in 1 Cor. 7.
Ferus in Matth. *26.*
Apud Epiſcop. Elienſ. reſp. ad Apol. Cardinal. Bellarm. cap. 1. p. 7.
Suarez in 3. diſp. 50. ſect. 3.

Barns Catholico-Romanus Pacificus. MS. f. 7. liter. C.

By

By which I ſee you are a man who would really ſeem to believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, and are afraid of nothing, but that it ſhould not be *impoſſible* enough for you to believe it. For his Lordſhip was only afraid, that though the word it ſelf were groſs enough, yet ſome of the more refined and ſubtle wits might *tranſubſtantiate* the word it ſelf and leave only the *accidents* of it behind, by taking it in a *ſpiritual* ſenſe; as *Bellarmin* confeſſes thoſe words of St. *Bernard*, *In Sacramento exhiberi nobis veram carnis ſubſtantiam ſed ſpiritualiter nor carnaliter*, have a true ſenſe; but adds, *that the word* ſpiritualiter *muſt not be too often uſed*; and the *Council* of *Trent* would ſeem to provide an evaſion by *Sacramentaliter*: and his Lordſhip not well knowing what they would have by ſuch expreſſions, therefore he ſaith, *properly taken it cannot ſtand with the grounds of Chriſtian Religion*. And for all thoſe expreſſions, *Bellarmin* as well as the *Council* take it in as groſs a manner as you can deſire; and I think the *Phyſician* who wanted *impoſſibilities enough to exerciſe his Faith*, needed nothing elſe to try it, but your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. But you ſay, *The term* P. 288.
indeed was firſt authoriſed by the Council of Lateran, *as* ὁμοούσιον *by that of* Nice; *but for the thing it ſelf ſignified by this term, which is a real converſion of the ſubſtance of bread into the body of Chriſt and of wine into his blood, 'tis clear enough, that it was ever held for a Divine truth.* If you prove but that, I will never quarrel with you about the *term*, call it *Tranſubſtantiation* or what you will; but we do not think it ſo clear, as not to want proofs ſtronger for the belief of it, than all the repugnancies of ſenſe and reaſon are againſt it. For it is a vain thing for you to attempt to prove ſo unreaſonable a Doctrine as this is, by ſome few lame citations of *Fathers*, unleſs you can firſt prove that the *Authority* of them is ſo great, as to make me believe any thing they ſay, though never ſo contrary to ſenſe and reaſon. If you could bring ſome places of the *Fathers* to prove that we muſt renounce abſolutely the judgement of ſenſe, believe things moſt contradictious to reaſon, yet you muſt firſt ſhew that the *evidence* they bring is greater than that of *ſenſe* or *reaſon*. Or that I am more bound to believe them, than I am to believe the greateſt evidence of *ſenſe* or *reaſon*. When you ſay, *In theſe caſes we muſt ſubmit reaſon to Faith*; we acknowledge it, when it is no manifeſt contradiction, in things ſo obvious to ſenſe or reaſon, that the aſſerting it, will deſtroy the uſe of our *faculties* and make us turn abſolute *Scepticks*; for then *Faith*, muſt be deſtroyed too. For may not a man queſtion, as well, whether his hearing may not deceive him as his ſight, and by that means he may queſtion all the *Tradition* of the *Church*, and what becometh of his *Faith* then? and if his *ſight* might deceive him in a proper object of it, Why might not the *Apoſtles* ſight deceive them in the *body* of Chriſt being riſen from the grave? And if a man may be bound to believe that to be falſe which his ſenſe judges to be true, what aſſurance can be had of any *miracles* which were wrought to confirm the *Chriſtian Doctrine*? and therefore his Lordſhip might well ſay, *That Tranſubſtantiation is not conſiſtent with the grounds of Chriſtian Religion*. But of this I have ſpoken already. That which I am now upon, is not how far *reaſon* is to be ſubmitted to *Divine Authority*, in caſe of *certainty* that there is a *Divine Revelation* for what I am to believe; but how far it is to be renounced, when all the evidence which is brought is from the *Authority* of the *Fathers*? So that the Queſtion in ſhort is, Whether there be greater evidence that I am bound to believe the *Fathers* in a matter contrary to ſenſe and reaſon, or elſe to adhere to the *judgement* of *them* though in oppoſition to the *Fathers* Authority? And ſince you do not grant their *Authority* immediately *Divine*; ſince you pretend not to places as clear out of them as the judgement of *ſenſe* and Part. 1. ch. 5. ſect. 7.

reaſon

reaſon is in this caſe; ſince you dare not ſay, that all the *Fathers* are as much agreed about it as the *ſenſes* of all mankind are about the matter in diſpute; I think with men who have not already renounced all that looks like reaſon, this will be no matter of Controverſie at all. From whence it follows, that ſuppoſing the *Fathers* were as clear for you (as they are againſt you) in this ſubject, yet that would not be enough to perſwade us to believe ſo many *contradictions* as *Tranſubſtantiation* involves in it meerly becauſe the *Fathers* delivered it to us. I ſpeak not this, as though I did at all fear the clearneſs of any *Teſtimony* you can produce out of them, but to ſhew that you take not a competent way to prove ſuch a Doctrine as *Tranſubſtantiation* is. For nothing but a ſtronger evidence than that of *ſenſe* and *reaſon*, can be judged ſufficient to overſway the clear dictates of both.

§. 8. This being premiſed, I come to conſider the clear evidence you produce out of *Antiquity* for this Doctrine, and ſince you pretend to ſo much choice in referring us to *Bellarmin* and *Gualtierus* for more, I muſt either much diſtruſt your judgement, or ſuppoſe theſe the *cleareſt* to be had in them, and therefore the examination of theſe will ſave the labour of ſearching for the reſt. And yet it is the great unhappineſs of your cauſe, that there is ſcarce one of all the Teſtimonies you make uſe of, but either its Authority is ſlighted by ſome of your own *writers*, or ſufficient *reaſons* given againſt it by many of ours. Your firſt is *of St.* Cyprian (*or at leaſt an Authour of thoſe firſt ages of the Church*) *who ſpeaking of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, ſaith, This common bread chang'd into fleſh and blood giveth life. And again, The bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples being chang'd not in its outward form or ſemblance, but in its inward nature or ſubſtance, by the omnipotency of the word is made fleſh.* As to this Teſtimony there are two things to be conſidered, the *authority*, and the *meaning* of it. For its *Authority*, you ſeem doubtful your ſelf, whether S. *Cyprian*'s or no (ſince *Bellarmin* and others of your own deny it) but *at leaſt* you ſay, *an Authour of thoſe firſt ages of the Church*, but you bring no evidence at all for it. *Bellarmin* grants that he is younger than St. *Auguſtine*; and others ſay that none mention him for 800 years after St. *Cyprians* time. And the abundance of *barbariſms* which that book is ſo full fraught with, manifeſt, that it is of a much later *extraction* than the time it pretends to. But the matter ſeems to be now out of queſtion; ſince the Book is extant in the *King* of *France's Library* with an *Inſcription* to *Pope Adrian*, and a *MSS.* of it is in the *Library* of *All-Souls* in *Oxford* with the ſame Inſcription and the name of *Arnaldus Bonavillacenſis*; who was St. *Bernards* co-temporary, and lived in the twelfth *Century*. And thoſe who have taken the pains to compare this Book with what is extant of the ſame Authour in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, not only obſerve the very ſame *barbariſms*, but the ſame conceptions and expreſſions about the *Sacrament* which the other hath. Although therefore I might juſtly reject this teſtimony as in all reſpects incompetent, yet I ſhall not take that advantage of you; but, ſuppoſing him an *Authour* as ancient as you would have him, I ſay he proves not the thing you bring him for. For which, two things muſt be enquired into. 1. What kind of *preſence* of *Chriſt* he aſſerts in the *Sacrament*. 2. What change he ſuppoſes to be made in the Elements. For your Doctrine aſſerts, *That there is a converſion of the whole ſubſtance of bread and wine into the ſubſtance of the natural body and blood of Chriſt, and that this conveniently, properly, and moſt aptly is call'd Tranſubſtantiation.* Now if this Authour ſpeaks wholly of a *real* but *ſpiritual preſence of Chriſt*, and if he aſſerts that the *ſubſtance of bread and wine do remain* ſtill, you can have no pretence at all left, that this *Authour* aſſerts your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Serm. de Cœnâ Domini.

De amiſſ. grat. l. 6. c. 2.

James of the Fathers, *p.* 12.

Albertinus de Euchariſt. Sacramento l. 2. p. 381.

ſtantiation. For the firſt, he expreſly ſaith, *That theſe things muſt not be underſtood after a carnal ſenſe:* viz. *unleſs ye eat the fleſh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye ſhall have no life in you; for Chriſt himſelf hath ſaid, His words are ſpirit and life.* And nothing can be more evident, than that this *Authour* ſpeaks not of any *corporeal*, but *ſpiritual preſence of Chriſt*, by the *effects* which he attributes to it, calling it *inconſumptibilem cibum, that food which cannot be conſumed:* and the *reaſon* he gives of it, is, becauſe *it feeds to eternal life*, and therefore he ſaith it is *immortalitatis alimonia, that which nouriſheth to immortality*; which cannot poſſibly be conceived of the *corporal preſence* of *Chriſt*, ſince you confeſs the *body of Chriſt* remains no longer in the *body* than the *accidents* of the *bread and wine* do. And after he tells us, *What the feeding upon the fleſh of Chriſt is*, viz. *our hunger and deſire of remaining in Chriſt, by which the ſweetneſs of his Love, is ſo imprinted and melted as it were within us, that the ſavour of it may remain in our palate and bowels, penetrating and diffuſing it ſelf through all the receſſes of ſoul and body.* And ſo juſt before he ſaith, *Chriſt did, Spirituali nos inſtruere documento, inſtruct us by a ſpiritual leſſon, that we might know, that our abiding in him is our eating of him, and our drinking a kind of incorporation, by the humility of our obedience, the conjunction of our wills, the union of our affections.* And in another place denies, *That there is any corporal union between Chriſt and us, but a ſpiritual*; and therefore adds afterwards, *As often as we do theſe things, we do not ſharpen our teeth to bite, but break and divide the holy bread by a ſincere Faith.* All which and many other places in that Authour make it plain, that he doth not ſpeak of ſuch a *corporal preſence* as you imagine, but of a *real* but *ſpiritual preſence* of *Chriſt*, whereby the ſouls of Believers have an intimate union and conjunction with Chriſt, which he calls *Societatem germaniſſimam*, in which reſpect they have *communion* with the *body of Chriſt*. But I need mention but one place more to explain his meaning, in which he fully aſſerts the *ſpiritual preſence* of *Chriſt*, and withall that the ſubſtance of the elements doth remain. *That immortal nouriſhment is given us, which differs from common food, that it retains the nature of a corporeal ſubſtance, but proving the preſence of a Divine power, by its inviſible efficiency.* So that what preſence of Divine power there is, is ſhewed in regard of the *effects* of it, not in regard of any *ſubſtantial change* of the *bread* into the *body of Chriſt*; for in reference to that *efficiency* he calls it, *immortal nouriſhment*, and afterwards, *That as common bread is the life of the body, ſo this ſuper-ſubſtantial bread is the life of the ſoul, and health of the mind.* But I know you will quarrel with me for rendring, *corporalis ſubſtantiæ retinens ſpeciem, by retaining the nature of a corporal ſubſtance*; for you would fain have *ſpecies* to ſignifie only the *accidents* of a *corporeal ſubſtance* to remain. This being therefore the main thing in diſpute, if I can evince that *ſpecies* ſignifies not the bare *external accidents*, but the *nature* of a *corporeal ſubſtance*, then this Authour will be ſo far from aſſerting, that he will appear *point-blank* againſt your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Now I ſhall prove that *ſpecies* was not taken then, for the meer *external ſhape and figure*, but for the ſolid body it ſelf eſpecially of ſuch things as were deſigned for nouriſhment. Thence in the *Civil Law* we read of the *ſpecies annonariæ*, and of the *ſpecies publicæ, largitionales*, and *fiſcales*; and thoſe who had the

Sed in cogitationibus hujuſmodi, caro & ſanguis non prodeſt quidquam; quia ſicut ipſe magiſter expoſuit, verba hæc ſpiritus & vita ſunt: nec carnalis ſenſus ad intellectum tantæ profunditatis penetrat, niſi fides accedat. Auctor de Cœnâ Domini, ſect. 4.

Eſus igitur carnis hujus quædam aviditas eſt, & quoddam deſiderium manendi in ipſo per quod ſic imprimimus, & eliquamus in nobis dulcedinem charitatis, ut hæreat palato & viſceribus ſapor dilectionis infuſus, penetrans & imbuens omnes animæ corporiſque receſſus. Id. ſect. 9.

ut ſciremus quod manſio noſtra in ipſo ſit manducatio, & potus quaſi quædam incorporatio, ſubjectis obſequiis, voluntatibus junctis, affectibus unitis. Id. ib.

Et non tam corporali quam ſpirituali tranſitione Chriſto nos uniri. Sect. 4.

Hæc quoties agimus, non dentes ad mordendum acuimus, ſed fide ſincerâ panem ſanctum frangimus & partimur. Id. ſect. 18.

Sed immortalitatis alimonia datur, à communibus cibis differens, corporalis ſubſtantiæ retinens ſpeciem, ſed virtutis divinæ inviſibili efficientiâ probans adeſſe præſentiam. Id. ſ. 2.

Id. ſect. 6.

care of corn are ſaid to be *curatores ſpecierum*; and thence very often in the *Codes* of *Juſtinian* and *Theodoſius*, there is mention of the *ſpecies vini*, *ſpecies olei*, *ſpecies tritici*. But leſt you ſhould think, it is only uſed in this ſenſe in the Civil *Law*, not only *Caſſiodore* and *Vegetius* uſe it in the ſame ſenſe for the *ſpecies tritici*, and *ſpecies annonariæ*; but, that which comes home to our purpoſe, St. *Ambroſe* uſes it where it is impoſſible to be taken for the meer *external accidents*, but muſt be underſtood of the *ſubſtance* it ſelf: ſpeaking of *Chriſts* being deſired to change the water into wine he thus expreſſes it, *Ut rogatus ad nuptias aquæ ſubſtantiam in vini ſpeciem commutaret*, that he would change the ſubſtance of water into the *ſpecies* of wine; Will you ſay, that Chriſt turned it only into the *external accidents* and not the *nature* of it? So when St. *Auſtin* ſayes, that Chriſt was the ſame food to the *Jews* and us, *ſignificatione non ſpecie*, he oppoſes *ſpecies* to a meer *type*, and therefore it imports the *ſubſtance* and reality of the thing. And ſo the *tranſlator* of *Origen* oppoſes the *regeneratio in ſpecie* to the *baptiſmus in ænigmate*, and the *manna in ænigmate* to the *manna in ſpecie*: in both which, being oppoſed to the *figure* it denotes the *reality*. And one of thoſe *Authours* whom you cite, in the very ſame *Book* and *Chapter* which you cite, uſes *ſpecies ſanguinis* for the *ſubſtance of blood*, for he oppoſes it to the *ſimilitudo ſanguinis*; for when the perſon objects, and ſayes, *That after the cup is conſecrated* ſpeciem ſanguinis non video, *I do not ſee the nature or ſubſtance of blood*; he anſwers him, *Sed ſimilitudinem habet, But it hath the reſemblance of it; for as* (ſaith he) *there is the ſimilitude of his death, ſo there is the ſimilitude of his blood.* Theſe may be ſufficient to ſhew that *ſpecies corporalis ſubſtantiæ*, does not relate to the *external ſhape and figure*, but to the *nature* and *reality* of it: So that his meaning is, although it remains ſtill the ſame *ſubſtance of bread and wine*; yet there is ſuch an inviſible *efficiency* of *Divine power* going along with the *uſe* of it, as makes it to nouriſh the *ſouls* of men to eternal life.

Cod. Theod. de curſu publ. & leg. 67. Arcad. l. ult. De munerib. & honor. Caſſiod. l. 12. Vegetius de re milit. l. 3. c. 3. Ambroſ. ſerm. 21. de die ſancto Epiphan. Auguſtin. in Pſalm 82. Origen. hom. 7. in Num. Ambroſ. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4.

§. 9. And now it will be no matter of difficulty at all to Anſwer the places you bring out of this Authour. The firſt is, *This common bread chang'd into fleſh and blood giveth life*. But how little this place makes to your purpoſe is eaſie to diſcern, becauſe we do not deny a *Sacramental change* of the *bread* into the *fleſh and blood of Chriſt*, but only that *ſubſtantial change* which you aſſert, but that Authour ſufficiently diſproves, even in that very ſentence from whence thoſe words are cited, if you had given them us at large. *For*, ſaith he, *that common bread being chang'd into fleſh and blood, procures life and increaſe to our bodies; and therefore from the uſual effect of things, the weakneſs of our Faith is helped, being taught by a ſenſible argument, that the effect of eternal life is in the viſible Sacraments, and that we are not united to Chriſt ſo much by a Corporal as Spiritual union.* In which words he compares the *ſign* and the *thing ſignified* together: that as the *bread* being Sacramentally changed into the *fleſh and blood of Chriſt*, doth yet really give *life* and *nouriſhment* to our *bodies*, (which certainly is far enough from that *ſubſtantial change* into the *body* of *Chriſt*, which you aſſert) ſo by that effect of the *ſign* it ſelf upon our *bodies*, our *Faith* is helped the better to underſtand the *efficacy* of the thing ſignified upon our *ſouls*, in order to eternal life; there being as *real*, though *ſpiritual*, *union* between *Chriſt* and *Believers*, as there is between the *bread* and our *bodies*. And that this is the plain and unſophiſticated meaning of this *Authour* in theſe words, I dare appeal to the impartial judgement of any intelligent Reader. By which we ſee, Thoſe firſt words of the *change* of the *bread* into the *fleſh* and *blood* of *Chriſt*, muſt be underſtood of a *ſacramental*, and not a *ſubſtantial change*. But your other is the great and (as *Bellarmin* thinks) unanſwerable

Panis iſte communis in carnem & ſanguinem mutatus procurat vitam & incrementum corporibus; ideoq; ex conſueto rerum effectu, fidei noſtræ adjuta infirmitas, ſenſibili argumento edocta eſt, viſibilibus ſacramentis ineſſe vitæ æternæ effectum, & non tam corporali quam ſpirituali tranſitione Chriſto nos uniri Id. lect. 5.

unanſwerable place; which you thus render, *The bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples, being changed not in its outward form and ſemblance, but in its inward nature and ſubſtance, by the omnipotency of the word is made fleſh.* As to which place, I muſt tell you firſt, that there are very ſhrewd ſuſpicions of ſome unhandſome dealings with it; for ſome great *Criticks* have aſſured us, that the place is corrupted, and that the ancient *MSS.* read it quite otherwiſe, *non effigie, nec naturâ mutatus*, which is ſo far from your purpoſe, that it is directly againſt it; and this ſeems far more conſonant to the following words; *For*, ſaith he, *as in the perſon of Chriſt, the humanity was ſeen, but the divinity lay hid; ſo in the viſible Sacrament, the divine eſſence doth infuſe it ſelf after an unexpreſſible manner.* In which it is conſiderable, how he doth parallel theſe two together; for as the *humane nature* of *Chriſt* did *ſubſtantially* remain, notwithſtanding the preſence of the *divine nature*, ſo to make good the parallel, the *ſubſtance of Bread and Wine* muſt remain too, and that becauſe he doth not ſay, That the *body* of *Chriſt* is preſent, which might exclude the *ſubſtance* of the *elements*, but the *divine eſſence*, which only imports a *ſpiritual* and *real preſence*. And when he ſaith, *That the Bread is neither changed in its form or nature, when by the Omnipotency of God it is made fleſh* (*i. e.* as to the real communion which believers have of the *body* of *Chriſt*; which is an act of *divine power* as well as *goodneſs*) he ſaith no more, than *Theodoret*, *Ephraim*, and *Gelaſius* do expreſly ſpeak. For, ſaith *Theodoret*, *The myſtical ſymbols after Conſecration, go not out of their own nature, but remain in their former ſubſtance, figure, and ſhape, and are viſible and tangible as they were before*: Which words, conſidering the occaſion and importance of them, are ſo expreſs, as nothing can be more. And in his former *Dialogue*, he gives an account, *Why the external ſymbols are called by the names of the body and blood of Chriſt, not by changing their natures, but by ſuperadding Grace to nature*; which is the ſame with that our Authour ſaith here, *Though neither figure nor nature be changed, yet by Gods Omnipotency it is made fleſh*; that μεθέσεις χάριτος, in *Theodoret*, and this *omnipotentia Dei*, here, importing the ſame thing. To the ſame purpoſe *Ephraim* the famous *Patriarch* of *Antioch* ſpeaks in *Photius*. *For*, ſaith he, *the body of Chriſt, which is received by believers doth not loſe its ſenſible ſubſtance; and yet is inſeparable from ſpiritual Grace.* And ſo *Gelaſius*, as plainly as either of the foregoing, aſſerts, *That the Sacraments of the body and blood of Chriſt, which we receive, are a divine thing, through and by which we are made partakers of the divine nature* (which anſwers to the *Omnipotency of God, by which it is made fleſh*, in our Authour) *and yet it doth not ceaſe to be the ſubſtance, or nature of Bread and Wine* (which is the ſame with the former clauſe, *That the Bread is not changed in figure or nature.*) So that the ancient reading of this place is not only conſonant to the other parts of his diſcourſe, but aſſerts no more than is in expreſs terms ſaid by genuine and unqueſtionable Authours; who plainly overthrew your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. For theſe teſtimonies being ſo expreſs for the remaining of the *ſubſtance of Bread and Wine* after Conſecration, are of far greater force againſt it, than the higheſt expreſſions concerning the change of the *elements* can make for it. For in theſe they

Panis iſte quem Dominus diſcipulis porrigebat, non effigie, ſed naturâ mutatus, omnipotentiâ verbi factus eſt caro. Id. ſect. 6.

Et ſicut in perſonâ Chriſti humanitas videbatur, & latebat divinitas; ita Sacramento viſibili, ineffabiliter divina ſe infudit eſſentia. Ib.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ μὴν ἡ ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἴδους· καὶ ὁρατὰ ἅττα καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Theodoret. Dialog. 2. Tom. 1. p. 85.

Οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλών, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προσθεὶς καινήν. Id. Dialog. 1.

Τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸ αἰσθητὸς οὐσίας ὂν ἐξίσταται, καὶ τὸ νοητὸς ἀδιάιρετον μένει χαρίτος. Apud Photium in Biblioth. Cod. 229. p. 794.

Certè Sacramenta quæ ſumimus, corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, divina res eſt, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur conſortes naturæ, & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia vel natura panis & vini. Gelaſ. tract. adverſ. Eutych. & Neſtor.

ſpeak their *judgements*, clearly and punctually againſt *Hereticks*, and ſpeak that which is abſolutely inconſiſtent with *Tranſubſtantiation*; but in their other they ſpeak *myſtically* and *ſacramentally*; and their moſt lofty expreſſions, muſt be underſtood by the nature and deſign of their diſcourſe, which is to repreſent *ſymbolical* things in the moſt lively and affecting manner. But when our *Adverſaries* are urged with the former teſtimonies, they then tell us, *That ſubſtance and nature are not alwayes taken properly, but ſometimes at large for the accidents or uſe of things:* but although this can never be applied to the places of the foregoing *Authours*, in their *diſputations* with the *Eutychian Hereticks*; yet from thence we are furniſhed by themſelves with a further anſwer to this place. So that although we admit of the preſent reading, *non effigie, ſed naturâ mutatus*, yet ſince by their own confeſſion *nature* doth not alwaies import the *ſubſtance* of a thing, they cannot in any juſtice or reaſon from hence inferr a *ſubſtantial change*. Let them then take their choice, Whether are the words of *ſubſtance* and *nature* in the *Fathers* alwaies to be taken properly, or no? If they muſt be taken ſo, we have three unqueſtionable teſtimonies of ancient *Fathers* directly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, and we only loſe the teſtimony of an *uncertain Authour*, built upon an *uncertain reading*, and contrary to other *expreſſions* in the ſame book: If they be not, then from the change of *nature* here expreſſed, no ſuch thing as a *ſubſtantial change* can be inferred, but only *accidental*, upon conſecration, in regard of the *ſacramental uſe* and effect of it. Which that it is nothing ſtrange in *Antiquity*, might be eaſily proved, but that our *Adverſaries* confeſſion ſaves me the labour of it.

§. 10. The ſecond *Teſtimony*, is of *Gregory Nyſſen*, out of whoſe *Catechetical Oration* you produce theſe words, *With good reaſon do we believe, that the Bread being ſanctified by God's Word, is changed into the body of the Word of God: and a little after, The nature of the things we ſee being tranſ-elementated into him.* I might here tell you, What Exceptions are taken againſt this book, as not being genuine, not only by *Proteſtants* (as *Fronto Ducaeus* would have it, becauſe of theſe expreſſions) but by others too. But I will not inſiſt on this, becauſe I ſee no ſufficient reaſon to queſtion the *Authority* of it; yet I know not how you can excuſe it from ſome *interpolations*, ſince he therein mentions *Severus*, an *heretical Acephaliſt*, who lived not till after *Gregory's* time; yet for the main of the book, I ſay as *Caſaubon* doth, that it is, *Opus planè eximium ſi paucos nævos excipias*, An *excellent piece* in the general, and becoming its Authour, ſome few *eſcapes* excepted. And the deſign of it being to ſhew, that *Chriſtian Religion* hath nothing abſurd or unreaſonable in it, it would be very ſtrange that he ſhould aſſert ſo abſurd and unreaſonable a Doctrine, as *Tranſubſtantiation* is. But there is nothing tending to that in the places cited, but only the uſe of thoſe two words, μεταποιεῖσθαι and μεταστοιχειῶν; for the main force of all, you ſay, depends upon them. So that if we can give a good account of them, without any *Tranſubſtantiation*, there remains no difficulty at all in theſe words of *Gregory Nyſſen*. For, we deny not that there is a *change* in the Elements after *Conſecration*, but we ſay, It is a *ſacramental*, and you, That it is a *ſubſtantial change*, and this you offer to prove from theſe two words here uſed in reference to the *Euchariſt*. The argument commonly formed by your Authours from the firſt words, is, *Whatſoever is changed, is not what it was before:* which we readily grant, ſo far as the *change* is; but ſtill it remains to be proved, that the *ſubſtance* is *changed* in it ſelf. But it were eaſie to ſhew, that the word μεταποιεῖσθαι, in multitudes of places of the *Fathers* is uſed for an *accidental* and *relative change*, and *Gregory Nyſſen* himſelf very frequently uſes the word, where it is capable of no other ſenſe, as when

Not. in Greg. Nyſſ. p. 45.

Iſ. Caſaub. Not. in Greg. Epiſt. ad Euſtath. &c. p. 99.

Καλῶς οὖν χθὲς καὶ τῇ πρὸ λέγω τὸ θεῖον ἀγιαζόμενον ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι πιστεύομεν, πρὸς ἐκεῖνο μεταστοιχειώσας τὸν μεταποιούμενον τὴν φύσιν. Gregor. Nyſſen. orat. Catechet. cap. 37. Tom. 3.

when he ſaith, *Of the ſhining of* Moſes *his face; that it was* ὅτι τὸ δεδοξότερον μεταποίησις, *a change to that which was more glorious*; and when he affirms, *the ſouls of men by the Doctrine of Chriſt,* μεταποιηθῆναι πρὸς τὸ θειότερον, *to be changed into that which is more divine.* And in this ſame *Catechetical Oration* he uſes it ſeveral times to the ſame purpoſe, *about the change which ſhall be in glorified bodies,* and the *change of mens ſouls by Regeneration*: But I need not inſiſt more on this, ſince I produced before the confeſſion of *Suarez*, that *ſuch expreſſions are more accommodated to an accidental mutation.* Neither is there any more ſtrength in the other word, μεταστοιχειῶν, though *Suarez* thinks this comes nearer the matter, and you confidently ſay, *What can here be ſignified by tranſ-elementation of the nature of the outward element, but that which the Church now ſtiles Tranſubſtantiation?* I will therefore ſhew you, what elſe is ſignified by that word which *Gregory* uſed, which cannot be properly rendred *tranſ-elementation*; for μεταστοιχειῶν, doth not come from the Noun στοιχεῖον, but from the Verb στοιχεῖν, and the *Greeks* expound στοιχεῖν by τυπῶν, χηματίζειν: and ſo μεταστοιχειῶν by μεταπλάττειν, μεταχηματίζειν, μεταπλάθειν; as you may ſee in *Suidas*, and others. So that it imports not a *ſubſtantial*, but *an accidental change* too: and in that ſenſe *Gregory Nyſſen* uſes it to expreſs *Regeneration* by, τοὺς ἐξ παλιγγενεσίας, μεταστοιχειωμένους, thoſe who are *tranſ-elemented by Regeneration*; Would you ſay, thoſe who are *tranſubſtantiated* by it? So that neither of theſe Teſtimonies import any more than that there is a *ſacramental change* in the *elements* after *Conſecration*, by which believers are made partakers of the *body and blood of Chriſt*; which is no more than we aſſert, and falls far ſhort of your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

De vitâ Moſis. Hom. 1. in Cant. Orat. Catech. c. 37. c. 40.

Epiſt. Canon.

§. 11. Your third Teſtimony is, of S. *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem*, which you would make us believe, *is ſo full and clear, that no Catholick could expreſs his own, or the Churches belief of this myſtery, in more full, plain, and effectual terms:* Neither ſhall I here ſtand to diſpute the reaſons on which thoſe *Myſtagogical diſcourſes* under his name are queſtioned, but proceed to the conſideration of the Teſtimony it ſelf. Which lyes in theſe words, *He that changed water into wine by his ſole will* (*at* Cana *in* Galilee) *doth he not deſerve our belief, that he hath alſo changed wine into blood? Wherefore let us receive with all aſſurance of Faith, the body and blood of Jeſus Chriſt. Seeing under the ſpecies of bread the body is given, and under the ſpecies of wine his blood is given, &c. knowing and holding for certain, that the bread which we ſee, is not bread* (*though it ſeem to the taſte to be bread*) *but the body of Jeſus Chriſt; likewiſe that the wine which we ſee* (*though to the ſenſe it ſeem to be wine*) *is not wine for all that, but the blood of Jeſus Chriſt.* This teſtimony you have patched together out of ſeveral places in that *Oration*, very warily leaving out that, which would ſufficiently clear the meaning of S. *Cyril* in the words you cite out of him. For it is evident, that his deſign is to perſwade the *Catechumens* (from whom the *myſterious preſence* of *Chriſts body* in the *Sacrament* was wont to be concealed) that the bread and wine were not *meer common elements*, but that they were deſigned for a greater and higher uſe to *exhibit* the *body and blood of Chriſt to believers.* And therefore he ſaith expreſly,

Cyril. Catech. Myſtagog. 4.

Do not conſider them as meer bread and wine, for they are the body and blood of Chriſt, according to his own words. By which it is plain he ſpeaks of the *body and blood of Chriſt*, as *ſacramentally*, and not *corporeally* preſent; for he doth not oppoſe the *body and blood of Chriſt*, to the *ſubſtance* of *bread and wine*, but to *meer bread and wine, i. e.* that they ſhould not look on the bread and wine as *naked ſigns*, but as *ſigna efficacia*, and that there is a *real preſence* of *Chriſt* in and with them to the *ſouls* of *believers.* And this is it which he ſaith, *That they ought not to make a queſtion of, ſince Chriſt ſaid, This is my body, and this*

Μὴ πρόσχες ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν δεσποτικὴν τοῦ φάσιν. Id. ib.

is

is my blood. For if he could by his will turn the water into wine, ſhall we not believe him, that he can change his wine into his blood? And after adds, *That under the ſymbols of bread and wine, the body and blood of Chriſt is given, that thou mayeſt be a partaker both of his body and blood.* You render this *under the ſpecies or form of bread and wine*, in *Cyril* it is ἐν τύπῳ, in that which is *the figure or repreſentation of the body and blood of Chriſt*; for τύπος is not taken in your ſenſe for the *external accidents*, which you call the *ſpecies*, but for that which doth *figure* or *repreſent*; for in his next Catechetical diſcourſe he calls the *bread and wine*, ἀντίτυπον σώματος καὶ αἵματος χριστοῦ, *the figure of the body and blood of Chriſt*, and this *Theophylact*, and thoſe who aſſert *Tranſubſtantiation*, deny that the *bread and wine* are ἀντίτυπα. For where there are ἀντίτυπα, there muſt be ἀληθέτυπα, which muſt anſwer to them; if *Cyril* therefore makes the *bread and wine* to be ἀντίτυπα, he muſt make the *body and blood of Chriſt* to be the ἀληθέτυπα, and conſequently they cannot be the *very body and blood of Chriſt* in your ſenſe. This ἀντίτυπον and τύπος here have the ſame *ſignification*, and are the ſame with σύμβολον, and ſo when he ſaith, ἐν τύπῳ μὲν ἄρτος δίδοταί σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἶνος δίδοταί σοι τὸ αἷμα, his meaning cannot be, under the *accidents of bread and wine*, the *body and blood of Chriſt* is *preſent* in your ſenſe, for he ſpeaks of ſuch a *preſence* as hath relation to the *receiver*, and not to the *elements*; for he ſaith, *Under the type of bread and wine, the body and blood of Chriſt is given to thee.* For otherwiſe it had been far more to his purpoſe to have ſaid abſolutely, that under the *ſpecies* of bread and wine, the *body and blood of Chriſt is ſubſtantially preſent*; but, when he ſaith only *that it is given to the receiver*, it doth not belong to ſuch a *corporeal preſence* as you dream of, but to ſuch a *real* and *ſpiritual preſence*, whereby believers are made partakers of the *body* and *blood of Chriſt*. And therefore *Cyril* is in this well explained by that of *Tertullian*, *Hoc eſt corpus meum, id eſt, figura corporis mei, This is my body*, i. e. *the figure of my body*, which is the ſame with τύπος; and by that of S. *Auſtin*, *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc eſt corpus meum, cum daret ſignum corporis ſui, Chriſt did not ſcruple to ſay, This is my body, when he gave the figure of his body*: And elſewhere ſpeaking of *Judas* his being preſent *ad convivium in quo corporis & ſanguinis ſui figuram diſcipulis commendavit & tradidit*, at that Supper in which *Chriſt commended and delivered to his Diſciples the figure of his body and blood.* So that hitherto there is nothing in the teſtimony of *Cyril*, importing *Tranſubſtantiation*. But it may be you think, there is more force in it, where he ſaith, That *we muſt not believe our ſenſes, that that which we ſee is not bread, though it ſeem to the taſte to be ſo, &c.* As to which I anſwer, that this place of *Cyril* muſt be explained by that which went before it, wherein he ſaid, *That we muſt not judge it to be meer bread, and meer wine.* For, although *ſenſe* be a ſufficient judge of that which it *ſees* and *taſtes*, yet it cannot be a *judge* of that which is exhibited by that which is *ſeen and taſted*; therefore, though to the *taſte*, it ſeems to be nothing but common *bread and wine*, yet they ought to believe that it is the communion of the *body and blood of Chriſt*. So that this is not to be underſtood of the *elements* themſelves, but of the *myſtical* and *ſacramental nature* of them. And, as *Cardinal Perron* hath obſerved, *It is an uſual thing, for the greater Emphaſis ſake, to deny that to be, which is meant only reſpectively; or to expreſs the affirmation and denyal of ſome qualities, by the affirmation or denyal of the ſubſtances themſelves*: as in that of *Tully*, *Memmius ſemper eſt Memmius*, for one; that in S. *Ambroſe*, *Ego non ſum ego*, for the other: and in many other inſtances to the ſame purpoſe, in which he ſaith, *Though the ſubſtance ſeem to be denied, yet only ſome quality is underſtood by it.* So when *Cyril* here ſaith, *That bread is not bread, &c.* he means not by it any alteration of the *ſubſtance* of it, but that it is not that *common bread* which it was before, and as our ſight and taſte judge it ſtill to be.

Catech. Myſt. 5.

Theophyl. in Marc. 14.

Tertul. c. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40. Auguſt. c. Adimant.

Comment. in Pſal. 3.

be. And what he ſaith here of the *bread* in the *Euchariſt*, he ſaid the ſame before of the *Chriſm*, where he compares them both together. *For* (ſaith he) *do not think that to be meer oyntment; for as the bread of the Euchariſt after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer bread, but the body of Chriſt; ſo this holy oyntment, is no longer meer, or common oyntment, after it is conſecrated, but a gift of Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit; being effectual through the preſence of his divine nature.* May not you then as well prove a *Tranſubſtantiation* here as in the *Euchariſt*, ſince he parallels theſe two ſo exactly together? And ſo elſewhere he ſpeaks concerning *Baptiſm*, *That they ought not to look on it as meer water, but as ſpiritul grace*; ſo that he means not a *ſubſtantial change* in the *Euchariſt*, any more than in the other, but only *relative* and *ſacramental*.

Ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ὑποπτεύσῃς εἰεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ἁγιας μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος οὐκέτι ἄρτος λιτὸς ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκέτι ψιλόν ἐστιν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν μετὰ ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ χρῖσμα χαρίσματος πνεύματος ἁγίου, παρουσίᾳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικόν γεγονεν. Cyril. Myſtag. 3. p. 235.

Catech. Illum. 3.

Neither can any thing more be inferred from your teſtimonies out of your laſt Authour S. *Ambroſe*, there being nothing at all in the words you produce, which implies any *ſubſtantial change* in the elements; for, although it be only *ſacramental*, yet it may be truly ſaid, *It is no longer that which nature hath framed it* (*viz.* meer bread and wine) *but that which the benediction of conſecration hath made it to be*: which I grant to be the body and blood of Chriſt, but not in your groſs and corporeal ſenſe. So S. *Chryſoſtome* ſaith of Baptiſm, *That its virtue is ſo great, it doth not ſuffer men to be men*; Will you therefore ſay, it *tranſubſtantiates* them? But you add further out of him, that he ſaith, *The force of benediction is greater than that of nature, ſeeing by that nature it ſelf is often changed?* And ſo we aſſert too, that the force of benediction far exceeds that of *nature*, which can ſo alter *common elements*, as by the uſe of them, to make us partakers of the body and blood of Chriſt. Your laſt words are out of the counterfeit S. *Ambroſe*, which are only general, *viz. this bread, is bread before the words of the Sacrament, but when conſecration comes, of bread, it is made the fleſh of Chriſt.* This we deny not, but the diſpute is about the ſenſe in which it is made ſo, whether by a *ſubſtantial change* of the *bread* into the *body* of *Chriſt*: and that this cannot be this Author's meaning, appears by thoſe known words which are uſed by him, ſpeaking of the efficacy of Chriſts power in the *Sacrament*, whereby he can make, *ut ſint quæ erant & in aliud commutentur, that they might be what they were, and yet be changed into ſomething elſe*. And, although a great Controverſie hath been raiſed about the reading of theſe words, yet this *reading* is not only juſtified by many Authors of competent Antiquity, but by two *MSS.* in the *K. of France's Library*, beſides many others elſewhere, and all editions, but that at *Rome*, and others which follow it. So that this *Authour* plainly aſſerts, that the *ſubſtance* of the *elements* does remain ſtill, and therefore can only be underſtood of a *ſacramental change*.

§. 12

Ambroſ. de his qui initiantur. c. 9.

Chryſoſt. in Act. hom. 23.

De Sacrament. l. 4. c. 4.

Thus I have, to ſatisfie you, examined your teſtimonies in behalf of *Tranſubſtantiation*; but whereas you referr me for more to *Bellarmin* and other *Catholick Authours*, I ſhall referr you for Anſwer to thoſe no leſs *Catholick Authors*, though no believers of *Tranſubſtantiation*, who have taken large and excellent pains in anſwering what they have brought; either from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. But you, having done your beſt in the latter, come at laſt to the former; but ſo pitifully manage your buſineſs as to *Scripture*, that it had been more for the intereſt of your cauſe, you had never medled with it. For you only ſay, *That the words of Scripture, taken in their proper and litteral ſenſe, do evidently ſhew, that the only ſubſtance which is delivered in this Sacrament, is the body of Chriſt, and that the ſubſtance of bread is no more there.* And all this comes only from hence, becauſe Chriſt ſaith, *This is my body*, which you parallel with one, *pointing to a hogſhead*

hogſhead of wine, ſaying, This is wine; and with one holding up a purſe full of money, ſaying, This is gold: who if they intend to ſpeak truth, muſt ſignifie, that the only liquor contained ſub propriâ formâ, *in the hogſhead is wine; and all the money in th purſe, gold.* But how weak this is, will eaſily appear, 1. That you take it for granted, that the expreſſion of Chriſt is not at all *figurative*, but of the ſame *nature* with thoſe Propoſitions you mention, whereas it is largely proved, from the nature of a *Sacrament*, from many parallel *expreſſions* in *Scripture*, from evidence of *Antiquity*, *Senſe*, and *Reaſon*, that theſe words of *Chriſt* cannot be otherwiſe than *figuratively* underſtood. 2. You ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* muſt ſpeak of the *individual bread*, when he ſaid, *This is my body*, as our parallel inſtances are of ſuch *individuals* as are pointed to. But *Bellarmin* will tell you, *That if Chriſt had ſpoken of the bread, when he ſaid, This is my body*, abſurdiſſima eſſet locutio, *it had been a moſt abſurd ſpeech.* And *Vaſquez* ſaith, *If the Pronoun* Hoc, *This, ſhould relate to the bread, he confeſſes, that by virtue of thoſe words, there could be no ſubſtantial change made in it; for the bread muſt remain ſtill.* So that by the confeſſion of your own Authours, your parallel is abſurd, and deſtructive to the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Vaſquez. diſp. 180. c. 9. n. 91.

§. 13. The third errour of a *General Council* confirmed by the *Pope*, which his Lordſhip inſiſts on, is, *That of adminiſtring the B. Sacrament to the Laiety under one kind only.* Of this he had ſpoken before; and thither you referr us for your Anſwer; but I purpoſely omitted the handling it there, becauſe it comes in more properly in this place. There his Lordſhip hath theſe words: *To break Chriſts Inſtitution is a damnable errour, and ſo confeſſed by* Stapleton. *The Council of* Conſtance *is bold, and defines peremptorily, that to communicate in both kinds is not neceſſary, with a* non obſtante *to the Inſtitution of Chriſt; and although* Bellarmin *anſwers, that the* non obſtante *only belongs to the time of receiving it after ſupper*, yet his Lordſhip ſhews *from the words of the Council, that the* non obſtante *muſt relate to both clauſes foregoing, and hath as much force againſt receiving under both kinds, as againſt receiving after ſupper. Yea, and the after words of the Council couple both together, in this reference; for it follows,* & ſimiliter, *And ſo likewiſe, though in the Primitive Church,* &c. *And a man by the definition of this Council may be an Heretick for ſtanding to Chriſts Inſtitution, in the very matter of the Sacrament: And the Churches Law for one kind may not be refuſed, but Chriſts Inſtitution under both kinds may. And yet this Council did not err; no, take heed of it.* But all this cannot perſwade you, *That the* non obſtante *relates to any thing but to the receiving after ſupper:* which I much wonder at, ſince the deſign of the *Decree* of the *Council* was not to determine ſo much concerning the *time* of receiving, as the *kinds* in which it was to be received. Now to have ſaid point blank, that, notwithſtanding the *Inſtitution of Chriſt* to the contrary, they decreed that the *Sacrament* ſhould be received in one kind only, would have been too plain and groſs: and therefore they fetch it about with a compaſs, and put in ſomething not ſo much controverted then, the better to diſguiſe the oppoſition between their *Decree* and *Chriſts Inſtitution.* But yet by the adding the *adminiſtration* in both *kinds* to the time of receiving, and the *non obſtante* following both, and the decree being againſt that which is acknowledged to have been *done by Chriſt*, nothing can be more evident, than that the ſenſe of the *Decree* implyes a *non obſtante* to *Chriſts Inſtitution.* For otherwiſe, To what purpoſe do they ſay, *Although Chriſt adminiſtred the Sacrament in both kinds, and although the Primitive Church ſo received it*, if they did not intend to decree ſomething contrary to

P. 259.

P. 270.

Licet Chriſtus poſt cœnam inſtituerit, & ſuis diſcipulis adminiſtraverit ſub utraque ſpecie panis & vini, hoc conſtabile Sacramentum; tamen, hoc non obſtante, non conſici debet poſt cœnam, nec recipi niſi à jejunis; ſimiliter, quod licèt in Primitivâ Eccleſiâ Sacramenta recipientur ſub utraque ſpecie à fidelibus, tamen hæc conſuetudo, ut Laicus ſub ſpecie panis tantum ſuſcipiatur, habenda eſt pro lege, quam non licet reprobare: & aſſerere hanc eſſe illicitam, eſt erroneum, & pertinaciter aſſerentes ſunt arcendi tanquam hæretici. Concil. Conſtant. Seſſ. 13.

that

that adminiſtration and the practice of the *Primitive Church?* Therefore, whether by the meer form of words the *non obſtante* doth relate to *Chriſts Inſtitution* or no, is not material, ſince the *Decree* it ſelf is directly oppoſite to it. Although therefore *they did not put receiving in one kind immediately after the* non obſtante (which is that you object) *as they do, not conſecrating after ſupper, and receiving faſting*, yet the force of it reacheth to what follows after: as not only appears by the connexion *And likewiſe*, but chiefly by the ſcope of the Decree it ſelf. For the *Proctors* of the *Council, Henricus de Piro*, and *Johannes de Scribanis*, in their authentick *Inſtrument*, never exhibited any Controverſie at all concerning the *time* of *receiving*, but only concerning the *Communion* in *both kinds, becauſe, they ſaid, there was an ill cuſtom* (ſo the obſerving *Chriſts Inſtitution* was called) *for ſome Prieſts to give the Cup to the Laity, therefore they deſired the Council*, &c. So that it appears, this bringing in the *time* of *receiving*, was only the *artifice* of the contrivers of the *Decree*, that they might with leſs noiſe and clamour thwart the plain *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*. And accordingly it appears by the title of the Decree, that the intent of it was to forbid the *giving the Sacrament to the people in both kinds*, and ſo *Caranza* delivereth the *Canon* it ſelf. *Præcipimus ſub pœnâ excommunicationis, quòd nullus presbyter communicet populum ſub utrâque ſpecie panis & vini.* *Caranz. Sum. Con. p. 415.* Indeed, in the late *editions* of the *Councils* by *Binius*, a complaint is ſuppoſed to be made concerning the celebrating the *Sacrament* after *Supper* by ſome which he ſeems to take out of *Cochlæus*, as appears by his *notes*; but in the *Inſtrument* it ſelf nothing appears of that nature: and ſince the *Decree* contains nothing againſt that cuſtom as well as the other; it ſeems probable that this was made uſe of the better to bring on the other. But, whether it were ſo or no, is not very much material; for however the *Council* confeſſing that *Chriſt did ſo adminiſter it*, and that it was the *cuſtom of the Primitive Church*, their prohibiting of it doth in its own nature imply a *non obſtante* to the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*. *Concil. Tom. 7. p. 2. p. 1042.*

But this is that you ſtiffly deny, *in ſaying, That neither the Decree of the Council, nor the practice of the Church in adminiſtring under one kind is contrary to the Inſtitution and ordination of Chriſt.* §. 14. P. 271. *For*, ſay you, *to ſhew this, the Biſhop ſhould have made it appear that Chriſt did ſo inſtitute this Sacrament of his laſt ſupper, that he would not have one part to be adminiſtred without the other, or that he would not have one part to be taken without the other. And it cannot be proved that Laymen are bound to receive in both kinds, from thoſe words, Drink ye all of this; For if this were a command and not a Counſel, it was given to the Apoſtles who all drunk of the Chalice.* So that the ſtate of the Queſtion is this, Whether the Primitive *Inſtitution* be univerſally obligatory to all *Chriſtians*, or no? For you ſuppoſe, that either it was only a *Counſel*, or elſe it had particular reference to the *Apoſtles*. For the clearing therefore of this *Queſtion*, there are but two ways whereby we can judge of the obligatory nature of ſuch *Inſtitutions*; either by an expreſs declaration of the will of the firſt *Inſtitutor*, or by the *Univerſal* ſenſe of the *Church* concerning the nature of that *Inſtitution*. And if theſe two appear evident in this preſent caſe, you will have no cauſe to queſtion, but the *communion in one kind is a violation of the Inſtitution of Chriſt*. There are two wayes whereby we may judge what the will of the *Legiſlator* is: Firſt, by an *expreſs poſitive command*. Secondly, by an *unalterable reaſon* on which the *Inſtitution* is founded. Now that both theſe are clear in the caſe of Communion in both kinds I now come to manifeſt. Firſt, by a *poſitive command*. For although we grant a difference between an *Inſtitution* and a *command*, in this reſpect, that the *Inſtitution* properly reſpects the *thing*, and a *command* the *perſon*; and that an *Inſtitution*, barely conſidered as ſuch, doth not bind all perſons to the *obſervance* of it; as we ſay, *Matrimony* is *Inſtituted* by *God*, but do not thence aſſert

that all perſons are *bound* to it, but yet take an *Inſtitution* as it refers to perſons, and ſo it is æquipollent with a *command*. And ſo *Chriſts Inſtituting* that all who believe ſhould be *baptized*, is of the nature of a *command* to that purpoſe. But here is a great difference to be made between ſuch things as were *done* at the *Inſtitution*, and ſuch things as were *Inſtituted* to be *done* afterwards. Thus *Chriſt* waſhed his *Diſciples feet*, adminiſtred *after Supper*, and only to *twelve*; but it doth not follow that theſe *circumſtances* muſt be ſtill obſerved, becauſe though they were done then at that *celebration*, yet *Chriſt* doth not *Inſtitute* or appoint the doing of them, when ever that *Sacrament* ſhould be adminiſtred afterwards. For we are to conſider, that though there were ſome things peculiar to the firſt *Inſtitution*, yet the main of it was intended for the *Church* in all following times. Or elſe we muſt make the celebration of the *Euchariſt* it ſelf to be a meer arbitrary thing. Which if it be not, there muſt lye an *obligation* on men for the *participation* of it; now this obligation muſt ſuppoſe a *Law*, and therefore we have gained this, that the *Inſtitution* of the *Euchariſt* doth imply a command for its obſervation in the *Church*. So that this action of *Chriſt* was not meerly a matter of *Counſel*, but there is ſomething in it perpetually *obligatory*: Becauſe it was not a peculiar *rite* appropriated to the preſent time, but intended for the future ages of the *Church*. This being proved in the *General*, that there is a perpetually obligatory command, implyed in the *Inſtitution*; we are now to enquire, How far this command extends? Whether it extended only to the *Apoſtles*, or elſe to all believers? That it was adminiſtred then to the *Apoſtles* only is granted, but the Queſtion is, In what capacity it was adminiſtred to them, Whether only as *Apoſtles*, or as *Believers?* and that muſt be judged by the intention of the *Inſtitution*, Whether it were of that nature as to reſpect their *Apoſtolical office*, or elſe ſome thing which would be common with them to all other Believers to the worlds end? If it were only and wholly proper to the *Apoſtles*, there can be no reaſon given, why the *Inſtitution* of the *Sacrament* ſhould continue after their times: neither could any other but the *Apoſtles* have any right, either to adminiſter or to receive it. It follows then, that this *Sacrament* was not inſtituted meerly for the *Apoſtles*; if not for them meerly, then what was contained in the *Inſtitution* doth concern others as well as them. Now there are four things commanded in the *Inſtitution*, *Take, eat, drink ye all of this, and, This do in remembrance of me.* If the *Inſtitution* doth not meerly reſpect the *Apoſtles* as ſuch but others alſo, then ſome of theſe things at leaſt muſt extend to others too conſidered as *Believers*. And if *ſome*, why not *all* of them? Were the *Apoſtles* conſidered as *Believers*, when they were bid *to take and eat?* and as *Apoſtles*, when *Chriſt* ſaid, *drink ye all of this?* What reaſonable pretext can be imagined for ſuch a groundleſs fancy? If they were not conſidered as *Believers*, when *Chriſt* ſaid *take, eat*; by what right can any *Believers take* and *eat?* if they were then, ſo were they likewiſe afterwards, when *Chriſt ſaid to them, Drink ye all of this.* As far therefore as I can poſſibly ſee, you muſt either admit the people to *drinking all of this*, or elſe deprive them of their right of *taking and eating*. And if you did ſpeak conſiſtently, you muſt ſay, that the peoples being admitted at all to the *Euchariſt* is an act of favour and indulgence in the *Church*, but not neceſſary by any command of *Chriſt*, the *Euchariſt* being adminiſtred to the *Apoſtles* and not the *people*; and therefore it being *indulgence* to admit them at all, it is in the *Churches* power to admit as far and to what ſhe pleaſes. This is the only rational way I can imagine, whereby you may defend the excluding the people from the *Cup*: But this you dare not ſay; and therefore are put to the weakeſt ſhifts imaginable to reconcile it with the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*.

Some

Some therefore ſay, *That all theſe are words only of invitation and not of command, and that they only give a right, and not oblige men to do it.* But if theſe be only words of *invitation*, what *precept* is there any where extant for the celebration of the *Euchariſt?* That they are an *invitation* we deny not; but we ſay they are ſuch an *invitation* as imply a *duty* to come, too. When a *Father* bids his *Children* come and ſit down at *Table, take and eat* their meat: this is an invitation, but ſuch as by reaſon of the *authority* of the perſon carry a *command* with them. So it is here, *Chriſt invites to come, to take, eat, and drink*; but ſo that it implies a *command* that men ſhould come; or elſe it muſt be wholly left at mens *liberty*, ſo that it is no *ſin* for men to neglect or refuſe to come. And if the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* only gives men a *liberty* to *take, eat, and drink*, without any obligation to theſe things as a *duty*, How comes the adminiſtration of the *Euchariſt* at all to become a *duty*, ſince there are no other words of command than what are contained in the *Inſtitution?* Which others being ſenſible of, they moſt unreaſonably diſtinguiſh between *Taking and eating*, which they *make an abſolute command, and, Drinking all of this, which they ſay is only a conditional precept:* and the reaſon they give, is, *becauſe S.* Paul *ſaith, This do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me*; and ſo, ſay they, *Do this, doth not imply a command for the doing it, but only the relation which that action hath to the death of Chriſt when they do it; for thoſe words, as oft as you do it, do ſuppoſe it not to be ſimply neceſſary, but only ſhew, when they do it, to what purpoſe it ſhould be done.* But if there be any weight, in this, it will as well hold ſtill concerning the participation of the *bread*, as the *cup*; for, as the *Apoſtle* ſaith *This do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me*, ſo he adds in the words immediately following, *For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do ſhew forth the Lords death till he come.* If therefore it notes only the relation of the *action* to its end without a *command* for performance in the *one*, it muſt do ſo in the *other* alſo. And ſo all the *Sacrament* will be a meer matter of *liberty* in the *Church*, whether men will obſerve it or no. But *Bellarmin* with wonderful ſubtilty hath found a *command* for the *one* and not the *other*; which is, *That in* Luke *after the bread, Chriſt ſaith, This do in remembrance of me, but omits it wholly after the cup; by which*, ſaith he, *we are to underſtand, that Chriſt commanded that the Sacrament ſhould be adminiſtred to all under the ſpecies of bread, but not under that of wine.* And this he is ſo tranſported with, *That in a rapture he admires the wonderful providence of God in the Scripture, who by this means hath taken away all poſſibility of evaſion from the Hereticks.* So it ſhould ſeem indeed, when even his Brethren the *Jeſuits* can ſcarce hold laughing at this ſubtilty. Since, S. *Paul* puts that expreſſion, *This do in remembrance of me*, not after the *bread*, but after the *cup*. And therefore may we not more juſtly admire at the *Providence* of *God* in thus ſuffering men who will not ſee the truth under a pretence of *ſubtilty*, to *infatuate* themſelves. And although it be added here, *As oft as ye do it*, yet both *Vaſquez* and *Suarez* ingenuouſly confeſs, that contains under it a *command* for the doing it. For ſaith *Vaſquez*, *Qui præcipit ut opere aliquo commemoratio fiat alicujus beneficii accepti, ex modo ipſo præcipiendi præcipit etiam ut fiat opus ipſum. Quis hoc non videat? He that commands that by ſomething to be done a commemoration ſhould be made of a benefit received; from the manner of commanding it, he doth command that very action to be done. Who doth not ſee this?* And *Suarez* ſaith, *thoſe words, Do this, or with that addition, In remembrance of me, or with that condition, As oft as ye do it*, ad eundem ſenſum referuntur, *come all to the ſame purpoſe.* So that ſtill it follows, if there be a *command* for one, there is for the other alſo. But yet there is a *ſubtilty* beyond any of theſe; which is, *That Chriſt in thoſe words in* Luke *after the diſtribution of the bread*, Hoc facite, *Do this*,

1 Cor. 11. 25.

Ver. 26.

De Euchariſt. l. 4. c. 25.

Luke 22. 19.

Vaſquez. in 3. Thom. c. 2. diſput. 213.

Suarez. in 3. Tom. 3. diſp. 71. ſect. 2.

did make the Apoſtles Prieſts; and therefore, although they did receive the bread as believers, yet they received the cup as Prieſts, and ſo that belongs only to the Prieſts and not to the people. What will not theſe men prove which they have a mind to! But it is their unhappineſs, that their own *ſubtilties* do them the moſt miſchief, as appears by theſe things conſequent from hence; which are repugnant to their own principles. 1. That *Prieſts* not conſecrating, ought to receive the Cup, as well as thoſe that do. For it is plain, that the *Apoſtles* did not conſecrate now, but only receive; and therefore this belongs to them as receiving, and not as conſecrating. And by the ſame reaſons that *Prieſts* not-conſecrating may receive, others may receive too. 2. That if they were made *Prieſts* by thoſe words, after the diſtribution of the bread, then they have no power to *conſecrate*, but only the *bread*. For the words are, *Hoc facite*, *Do this*, i. e. *that which Chriſt had then done*. Otherwiſe, if thoſe words be taken with reference to the *Cup*, then if the *Apoſtles* received the bread as *believers*, they received the *Cup* ſo too: for theſe words, *Do this*, muſt not relate to their *receiving*, but to their *power* of *conſecration*. 3. If this be taken generally, *Do this*, and ſo giving them a *power* to do all that *Chriſt* did, then it will amount to a *precept* for all who adminiſter to follow *Chriſts example* in the *Inſtitution*. And therefore, as he did adminiſter, the *Cup*, as well as the *Bread*, to all that were preſent, then all others will be bound to do ſo, if their power of *adminiſtration* be derived from theſe words, *Do this*, and they refer to the whole action of *Chriſt*. But I know what Anſwer will be here given, *That theſe words relate to the Sacrifice, and not to the Sacrament*, Hoc facite *implying their power of ſacrificing, as to which they ſay, both elements are neceſſary, but not to the Sacrament*. But 1. Not to enter on the Diſpute about the *Sacrifice*; if both *elements* be neceſſary to it, then it was great reaſon that the words making them *Prieſts*, ſhould come after both *elements*, and therefore it cannot in reaſon be deduced from thoſe words which are ſpoken only after the bread. 2. If theſe words relate to the *Sacrifice*, and not to the *Sacrament*, By what authority do they adminiſter the *Sacrament*? What other words are there to give them a power to do the one diſtinct from them, whereby they pretend a *right* for the other. 3. There is no evidence at all from *Antiquity*, that *Hoc facite* hath any reſpect to the *Euchariſt* as a *Sacrifice*, or to the making the *Apoſtles Prieſts*. And ſo much is confeſſed by *Eſtius*, viz. *that neither is this expoſition found in any ancient Writer, nor is it ſuitable to our Saviours purpoſe. For, he ſaith, it is not abſolutely ſaid* Facite, *but* Hoc facite, i. e. *that which ye ſee me do, do ye likewiſe*. So that ſtill, by virtue of theſe words, thoſe who do receive authority to adminiſter, are bound to follow *Chriſts example*, and that as he did adminiſter in *both kinds* to all who were preſent, ſo ought they to do likewiſe. But there is one Exception yet more left, which is the laſt Reſerve, *viz. that although it be granted to be a command, that the Cup ſhould be adminiſtred to all, yet it is only a poſitive command, binding in the general; but yet it is of the nature of all affirmative precepts, that though it always binds, yet not at all times, but only in caſe of neceſſity, of which neceſſity the Church is the moſt competent Judge; and therefore if the Church do not think it neceſſary, then the obligation ceaſes.* To which I anſwer, 1. That upon this ground it will be in the *Churches* power to repeal or ſuſpend all divine *poſitive precepts* as well as this. For the reaſon of this will hold for all others, which is, that they do not oblige, as they ſpeak, *ad ſemper*, but only *ſemper*, i. e. *not at all times*, though they never *ceaſe to oblige*. And therefore on this ground, for all that I can ſee, the *Church* may as well repeal the uſe of *Baptiſm*, or the *Euchariſt* it ſelf, as the *communion in both kinds*; all being of an equal nature, as *affirmative precepts*. But, Is it poſſible to imagine that

Eſtius in l. 4. ſenten. diſt. 12. ſect. 11.

that *Christ* appointing *positive Institutions* in his *Church*, and giving *precepts* and plain directions about them, should yet leave it in the power of any men to reverse, alter, suspend the *obligation* to the performance of those commands? Did not he foresee all cases of *necessity*, when he first appointed these things, and, if notwithstanding that, he makes a plain command, for the observance of them: What can such a pretended power in the *Church* signifie, but an authority to alter or repeal what she pleases in the *Laws* of *Christ*? 2. There is a great deal of difference between the nature of the *obligation* of *affirmative precepts*, and the prohibiting the use of something positively commanded. For, although *positive precepts* do not bind at all times, yet that reaches only to the thing it self, and not to the *mode* of performance. Thus we say, That the *Eucharist* being a *positive Institution*, doth not oblige men at all times to be partakers of it; but if on that account any *Church* should undertake to forbid the celebration of it, this were a direct violation of the *Law* it self, and not an *Interpretation* of it in regard of circumstances. And whatever obligation of this nature there is, it respects the whole *duty*; But it doth by no means follow, that therefore in the *celebration* the *Church* may declare what may be used, and what not. For the *manner* of *performance* in case it be performed at all, is absolutely *commanded*; it is only the *performance* in general, which is of the *nature* of a *positive precept*. Thus we say, Men are not *bound to pray at all times*, though they be *always bound to pray*; but in case men do pray, they are indispensably bound to pray as *God* hath required them to do it. So we say here, That men are not *bound* at all times to administer, or receive the *Eucharist*; but, in case they do, they are indispensably bound to receive it according to *Christ's Institution*. So that this of *communion* in *both kinds*, relates to the *manner* of a *positive precept*, and is not a distinct *positive precept* by it self; and therefore is indispensable by any authority of the *Church*. Besides, your *Church* doth not meerly *suspend* the exercise of this in case of necessity, but forbids men the doing it, which is a direct and wilful *violation* of the *Institution* of *Christ*. And therefore the Question is not as it is strangely perverted by some of you, *Whether it be necessary at all times to receive the Cup* (although even that be true in case of receiving at all) *but, whether it be in the Churches power at all to prohibit the receiving it*; and this we say, and are ready to make good to be a presumptuous violation of the *Laws* of *Christ*, and an usurping an *Authority* which may as well extend to all positive *Institutions*. And thus I hope I have made that appear, which you say his Lordship should have done, viz. *that Christ did so institute the Sacrament of his Last Supper, that he would not have one part to be administred without the other, nor one part to be taken without the other.*

§. 16. The same I might also at large shew, from the *Reasons* of this *Institution*, that they do equally belong to the people, as well as the *Priests* and that those reasons are of a nature as unalterable as the *Institution* it self; whereby I should have shewed the vanity of your distinction of the *Eucharist* into a *Sacrament*, and a *Sacrifice*, and the absurdity of your Doctrine of *Concomitancy*; but that would be too large for our present design: and that which you give me not sufficient ground to enter upon, since the obligation is sufficiently cleared from the *Institution* it self. I therefore proceed to shew, that the *Primitive Church* did always understand the *Communion* in both kinds to be an indispensable part of the *Institution* of *Christ*. Which one would think were evident enough from S. *Paul*, in his bringing the *Corinthians* back to the *Primitive Institution*, as that unalterable Rule which they were to observe. For if, becaufe of some ill customs which had obtained amongst them, he tells them, *This is not to eat the Lords Supper*; How much more would he have said so, if there had been a *mutilation* of 2 Cor. 11. 20.

the

the *parts* of it? And all along in his diſcourſe he ſuppoſes *Chriſts Inſtitution* to be the indiſpenſable Rule which they ought to obſerve; *That which I have received of the Lord, I delivered unto you*: not, certainly, to leave it in their power: Whether they would obſerve it or no, but to ſhew them, what their duty was, and what they ought unalterably to obſerve. Elſe he would never have told them ſo much of the danger of *unworthy receiving, in eating the Bread, and drinking the Cup of the Lord unworthily*; For, Can we poſſibly think, that the rudeneſs of their acceſs to the *Lords Table* was ſo great a ſin, and the violation of his *Inſtitution* to be none at all? The *Apoſtles* were ſuch ſtrangers to the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*, that ſtill both *eating and drinking* were ſuppoſed then, even by the moſt unworthy receivers. There were then no ſuch *fears* of the *effuſion* of the *blood of Chriſt*, or the irreverence in receiving it, and much leſs of the *long beards* of the *Laity*; which are the worſhiptul reaſons given by *Gerſon* and others, why the people ſhould not be admitted to the *uſe* of the *Chalice*. I do verily think the *Apoſtles* had as much care to preſerve the due reverence of the *Sacrament*, as ever the *Councils* of *Conſtance* or *Trent* had; but they thought it no way to preſerve the reverence of the *Sacrament*, by ſhewing ſo little to *Chriſt*, as not to obſerve his *Inſtitution*. But you very kindly grant that which you knew was impoſſible to be denied, *viz. That in ancient times, when, you ſay, the number of Chriſtians was ſmall, it was the ordinary cuſtom for all that would (the Laity as well as others) to receive the Euchariſt in both kinds; but*, ſay you, *we averr, this cuſtom proceeded meerly out of free devotion, and not out of any belief, that it was abſolutely neceſſary ſo to do, by virtue of Chriſts precept.* It is no great matter what you *averr*, ſince you *averr* ſo monſtrous a Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as confidently as you do this, and with much alike reaſon. For I have ſhewed already, that the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* in reference to this, is perpetually obligatory, and that the *Apoſtles* look upon that as an *unalterable Rule*, and therefore your *averring* ſignifies nothing, when you never offer to prove what you averr. But, I pray tell me, By what *means* would you underſtand what *precepts* are perpetually obligatory, which are not clear to our preſent purpoſe? If *poſitive command, immutable reaſon, univerſal practice* of the *Church* may prove any thing ſo, we have all theſe plain and clear for Communion in both kinds. And not the leaſt ſuſpition or intimation given, that they looked on it as a matter of *free devotion*, but of *indiſpenſable neceſſity*. But, What mean you in ſaying, *When the number of Chriſtians was ſmall, they received it in both kinds?* Do *Chriſts Inſtitutions* vary according to the numbers of *Communicants?* Hath not *Chriſt* the ſame power to oblige *many* as a *few?* or, Do you think the numbers of breakers of his *Inſtitution* make the fault the leſs? But, When was it the number of *Chriſtians* was ſo ſmall? Only in the *Apoſtles* times, or as long as the cuſtom laſted of *communicating* in both kinds? Do you think the number of *Chriſtians* was ſo ſmall in the *Primitive times?* If you do, you lamentably diſcover your ignorance in the *Hiſtory* of thoſe times: Read the *Chriſtians Apologies* over, and you will believe the contrary. But, Did this ſmall number continue in the time of the *Chriſtian Emperors*, even till after a *thouſand years* after Chriſt? For ſo long the Communion in both kinds continued ſo inviolably, that neither you, nor any before you, are able to produce one *Inſtance* of a publick and ſolemn celebration of the *Euchariſt* in the *Church* wherein the *People* did not communicate in both kinds. And, Could a matter ſo indifferent as you ſuppoſe this to be, meet with no perſons all this time, who out of reverence to the *blood of Chriſt*, ſhould deny giving it to the *People*? Nothing then but an unmeaſurable confidence, and a reſolution to ſay any thing, though never ſo falſe or abſurd (if it tend to the intereſt of your *Church*) could make you ſay, *That communion in one kind*

P. 290.

kind was always, even in the first five or six hundred years, allowed publickly as well in the Church, as out of it. Than which, if you had studied it, you could scarce have uttered a *greater untruth*; and in which there are such *multitudes* of your own party bearing witness against you. And *Bellarmin* is so far from helping you out in it, that he is extremely at a loss to offer at any thing which hath any tendency that way. But before we come to consider the Instances and Exceptions you make, we must somewhat further see, what the practice and sense of the *Church* was, that we may the better judge, Whether communion in both *kinds* were looked on as a matter only of *free devotion*, or as something necessary by virtue of *Christs Institution*. And for this I shall not insist on those multitudes of Testimonies, which manifest the practice it self, but briefly touch at some few, which more directly prove that what they did, was, Because in doing otherwise, they should have violated the *Institution* of Christ. To pass by therefore the Testimonies of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, all clear for the practice; the first I insist on, is that of S. *Cyprian* against those who gave water in the *Chalice*, instead of wine; for, whosoever doth but read the very entrance of that Epistle, will soon find that he looked on *Christs Institution* in all the parts of it as *unalterable*. *For* (saith he) *although I know, that most Bishops do keep to that which agrees with the truth of the Gospel, and what our Lord hath delivered; and do not depart from that which Christ our Master hath commanded and practised: yet because some, either through ignorance, or simplicity, in sanctifying the Cup of our Lord, and delivering it to the people, do not that which Jesus Christ our Lord and God, the Author and teacher of this Sacrifice, did and taught; I have thought it a necessary part of my duty to write to you, that if any one continue in that error, he may, by discovering the light of truth, return to the root and fountain of our Lords Tradition.* I insist on this Testimony, not only for the clearness of it, as to the custom of giving the *Cup* to the people; but especially for the evidence contained in it, of the unalterable nature of the *Institution* of Christ. For that he looks on as the great fault of them who ministred *water* instead of *wine*, that they therein departed from the example and precept of *Christ*. Now there cannot be produced any greater evidence of any obligation as to this, than there is as to the giving the *Cup* it self. For here is *Christs example* and *institution* equally as to both of them, and that in the same words, *Drink ye all of it*. If that were such a departing from the *Institution* to alter the *Liquor*, would it not have been accounted as great, to take away the *Cup* wholly? For afterwards he adds, *If men ought not to break the least of Christs commands, How much less those great ones which pertain to the Sacrament of our Lords Passion, and our Redemption? or to change it into any thing, but that which was appointed by him?* And if not to change the matter, certainly neither can it be lawful to order the *administration* otherwise than *Christ* appointed. I know *Bellarmin* saith, *The parity of reason will not hold, because this is to corrupt the matter of the Sacrament:* but S. *Cyprian* doth not insist on that as his reason, but the departing from the *Institution* of *Christ*, and this is done by one as well as the other. But he adds, *That there was a precept for that, Do this.* And so, say we, was there as plain for the other, *Drink ye all of this.* So that the parity of reason is evident for the one as well as the other. Upon the same ground doth *Pope Julius* afterwards condemn the using *milk* instead of *wine*, because contrary to *Christs Institution*; and so he doth the *dipping the bread in the Chalice:* From whence we infer, that they looked on

Quanquam sciam Episcopos plurimos, Evangelicæ veritatis ac Dominicæ traditionis tenere rationem, nec ab eo quod Christus Magister & præcepit & gessit, humanâ & novellâ institutione decedere; tamen quoniam quidam vel ignoranter vel simpliciter in calice Dominico sanctificando, & plebi ministrando, non hoc faciant quod Jesus Christus, Dominus & Deus noster, sacrificii hujus Auctor & Doctor, fecit & docuit; religiosum pariter ac necessarium duxi, has ad vos literas facere, ut si quis in isto errore adhuc teneatur, veritatis luce perspectâ ad radicem atq; originem traditionis Dominicæ revertatur. Cyprian. Epist. 63.

De Euchar. l. 4. c. 26.

on *Chriſts Example* and *Inſtitution* in the adminiſtration to be *unalterable*. But moſt expreſs is the Teſtimony of *Pope Gelaſius*, who finding ſome, from the remainders of *Manichaiſm*, did abſtain from the *Cup*, gives expreſs order, *That they who were infected with this odd ſuperſtition, either ſhould receive the whole Sacrament, or abſtain wholly from it; becauſe the dividing one and the ſame myſterie, cannot be done without great ſacriledge.* To this, *Bellarmin* tells us, two Anſwers are commonly given; one, *That theſe words are meant of Prieſts*; another, *That they relate only to thoſe ſuperſtitious perſons*; but both of them are ſufficiently taken off by the reaſon aſſigned, which is not fetched either from their *Prieſthood*, or *Superſtition*, but only from the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, that it would be *ſacriledge* to part thoſe things, which *Chriſt* by his *Inſtitution* had joyned together. Thus we ſee, the ſenſe of the *Church* is clear, not only for the *practice*, but the *command* too; and the ſinfulneſs of the *violation* of it. Although to you one would think it were wholly needleſs to prove any more than the *Univerſal Practice*, ſince the *Tradition* of the *Church* is equal with you, with an *unwritten word*; but that is, when it makes for your purpoſe, and not otherwiſe. For in this caſe, though the *Inſtitution* be expreſs, the univerſal *practice* of the *Church* for at leaſt a thouſand years unqueſtionable; yet becauſe it contradicts the preſent ſenſe and practice of your *Church*, all this ſignifies nothing at all with you. So true is it, that it is neither *Scripture* nor *Antiquity*, which you really regard, but *Intereſt* and the *Preſent Church*. And what *Cuſanus*, like a downright man, ſpake out in this caſe, is that you muſt all at laſt take ſanctuary in, *That the Scriptures muſt be interpreted according to the current practice of the Church*; and therefore *it is no wonder if they be interpreted at one time one way, and another time another way.* And though this ſeem a very great abſurdity, yet it is no more than is neceſſary to be ſaid by ſuch who maintain things ſo contrary to *Scripture*, and the practice of former ages of the *Church*.

Comperimus quod quidam, ſumptâ tantummodo corporis ſacri portione, à calice ſacri cruoris abſtineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam neſcio-quâ ſuperſtitione docentur obſtringi) aut Sacramenta integra percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia diviſio unius & ejuſdem myſterii ſine grandi ſacrilegio non poteſt provenire. Apud Gratian. c. Comper. de Conſecr. diſt. 2.

Cuſan. ep. 27.

§. 17. P. 289. But you are ſo far from thinking this contrary to the *practice* of the *Church* in former ages, that you ſay, *Not only in S.* Thomas *his time, but in all times of the Church, it was both publickly allowed, and commonly by ſome practiſed even in Churches, to receive under one kind only.* A bold Aſſertion, and which is confidently denied by very many of your own Communion. For not only *Caſſander* often confeſſes, that for above a thouſand years after Chriſt, no inſtance can be produced of publick Communion in one kind: But *Father Barns* acknowledges not only that *Communion* in both *kinds*, is much more agreeable to *Scripture*, *Fathers*, and the *Univerſal Church*, but that *per ſe loquendo jure divino præſcribitur*, taking it in it ſelf, it is commanded by a *Divine Law*. But I know theſe men are too honeſt for you to own them, but as to the univerſal practice of the *Church* it is confeſſed by *Ruardus*, *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, *Lindanus*, and many others. But we need no more than your S. *Thomas* himſelf, even in that very place, where you ſay, *He rather makes for you, than againſt you*; for, when he ſaies, that *Provide in quibuſdam Eccleſiis obſervatur ut populo ſanguis non detur, It was a cuſtom providently obſerved in ſome Churches, not to give the Sacrament in the form of wine to the Laity*; He thereby ſhews indeed, that in his time about *A. D.* 1260. this cuſtom did in ſome places obtain, but yet ſo, that the *univerſal practice* had been to the contrary; for ſo much is confeſſed by him in his Commentaries on S. *John*, where his words are, *ſecundum antiquam in Eccleſiâ conſuetudinem omnes ſicut communicabant corpori, ita communicabant & ſanguini, quod etiam adhuc in quibuſdam Eccleſiis ſervatur. According to the ancient cuſtom of the Church, all did communicate in both kinds,*

Caſſander de Comman. ſub utrâ ſp. 1025, 1027, 1039. & Pariſ. Barns Catholico-Rom. Pariſ. ſect. 7. lit. 8.

Ruard. Tapper. Tom. 2. p. 328. Alphonſ. à Caſtro. hereſ. 38. Lindan. Panop. l. 4. c. 56.

Aquinas. p. 3. q. 80. Art. 12.

kinds, which as yet is observed in some Churches. Now, Whether the universal practice of the Church in former times, or the practice of some Churches in his time, were more agreeable to the *Divine Institution*, we may appeal to *Aquinas* himself, who elsewhere gives this account, Why the elements of bread and wine, were made use of, and delivered severally, *That they might denote a complete refection, and fully represent the death and passion of our Saviour.* On the same accounts *Bonaventure* and *Alensis* make both kinds necessary to the *Integrity* of the *Sacrament.* And the latter (who was *Master* to the two former) says expressly, *That whole Christ is not contained sacramentally under either kinds; but his flesh under that of bread, and his blood under that of wine.* Than which nothing can be more destructive to the Doctrine of *Concomitancy.* And it is learnedly proved by *Pet. Picherellus*, that the *bread* was appointed to represent not the *body* in its compleat *substance*, but the meer *flesh*, when the *blood* is out of it, according to the division of the *Sacrifices* into *flesh* and *blood*; from whence it appears, that the *Sacrifice* of Christs death cannot be represented meerly by *one* kind, and that whole *Christ* is not contained under *one*, in the administration of it. And therefore *Alensis* rightly determines, that the *res Sacramenti* cannot be *perfectly* represented by one kind; and thence says, *He that receives but in one kind, doth not receive the Sacrament perfectly.* No wonder therefore that he tells us, *That some religious persons in his time* (when the contrary custom, through the superstition of people, had somewhat prevailed) *did earnestly desire that the Sacrament might again be received in both kinds.* Thus we see, when this custom did begin, reason and argument was still against it, and nothing pleaded for it, but only some superstitious fears of some *accidental effusions* of the *blood of Christ.* But you are the man, who would still perswade us, *That Communion in one kind was not only publickly allowed, but by some practised even in Churches in all times of the Church.* And therefore in reason we must give attendance to your impregnable demonstrations of it. For otherwise, say you, *How is it possible that the Manichees should find liberty and opportunity to communicate amongst Catholicks in Catholick Churches, without being perceived, since they never drank wine, nor communicated under the form of wine? as 'tis certain they frequently did in S.* Leo's *time, and after.* But you have very unhappily light of this for your first proof, which is so evident against you. For *Leo*, who mentions the *Manichees* communicating in *Catholick Churches*, tells the *Catholicks*, What way they might discern them from themselves, viz. *that though they received the bread, yet they refused the wine; by which*, saith he, *you may discover their sacrilegious hypocrisie, and by that means they may be expelled out of the society of Catholicks.* You were therefore very ill advised, to make choice of this for your argument, which makes it plain, that all *Catholicks* did receive in *both kinds*, and that the *Manichees* might be thereby known that they did not. And if it were the custom for the *Catholicks* sometimes to receive in both kinds, and sometimes not, (which is all the shift *Bellarmin* hath) and the *Manichees* not at all, this could be no note of *distinction* between them; for, although the *Manichees* might not receive at one time, they could not tell but they might at another. Now *Leo*'s intention being, to give such a note of distinction, that they might not receive at all among them, it evidently follows, that all the *Catholicks* did constantly receive in both kinds, and that they were only *Manichees* who did abstain from the *Cup.* For that Story which *Bellarmin* insists on, and you refer to, *of the woman, who being a Macedonian Heretick, yet pretending to communicate with the Catholicks, had the bread*

Aquinas c. Gentes. l. 4. cap. 61.
Bonavent. l. 4. dist. 8. Art. 2. q. 2.
Alensis. p. 4. q. 6. memb. 3. Art. 2.
P. Picherel. de Missâ. c. 4.
Alens. p. 4. q. 31. memb. 1.
Alens. p. 4. q. 53. memb. 1.

Quam ad tegendam infidelitatem suam nonnulli audeant interesse mysteriis, tam sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujusmodi homines & hisce manifestentur indiciis, & quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati & proditi à sanctorum societate, sacerdotum autoritate pellantur. Leo. Sermon. quadragesf. 4.

which her Maid brought with her, and which ſhe took inſtead of the Euchariſt, turned into a ſtone in her mouth, upon which ſhe runs preſently to the Biſhop, and with tears confeſſed her fault; as we take it wholly upon the Faith of *Sozomen*, from whom *Nicephorus* tranſcribes it, ſo I cannot imagine what it proves for your purpoſe, unleſs it be, that they in whoſe *mouths* the *bread* turns into a *ſtone* too, will hardly have patience till the *Cup* be adminiſtred to them. For ſo both *Sozomen* and *Nicephorus* relate it, that immediately upon her feeling it to be a *ſtone*, ſhe ran to the *Biſhop*, and ſhewed him the *ſtone*, acknowledging with tears her miſcarriage. But beſides this, you bring ſeveral *Inſtances* from the Communion of *Hermites in the wilderneſs, of travellers on their journeys, of ſick perſons in their beds, and private Communions in houſes, and laſtly, little Children in the Church, and at home in their Cradles, which communicated in form of wine only.* And, Are not all theſe invincible proofs, that there was a publick, ſolemn adminiſtration of the Communion in one kind publickly allowed in *Churches* in all times? When you can prove that the *Communion* of *Hermites* was in the *Church*, or that they did not receive as well the *wine* as the *bread* in the *wilderneſs*, or that ſuch Communion was approved by the *Church*: That the *Communion* of *Travellers* was not *meer Communion in Prayers*, as *Baronius* and *Albaſpinæus* aſſert, without any participation of the *Euchariſt* at all; or if it were, that it was only a *participation* in *one kind* (againſt which *Albaſpinæus* gives many reaſons:) That the *Communion of the ſick* was without *wine*, when *Juſtin Martyr* ſaith, *That both bread and wine were ſent to the abſent*: when *Euſebius* tells us, That the *bread* given to *Serapion*, was *dipt*; when S. *Hierom* ſaith of *Exuperius*, That he preſerved the *blood in a glaſs for the uſe of the ſick*: That *Private Communions* were without *wine*, ſince *Gregory Nazianzen* ſaith; his Siſter *Gorgonia, preſerved both the ſymbols of the body and blood of Chriſt*; and *Albaſpinæus* confeſſes, that one might be carried home as well as the other; or that theſe were approved by the *Church*, ſince *Durantus* ſaith, *That the uſe of Private Communions coming up by perſecutions, were abrogated afterwards*; and are expreſly condemned by the *Council* of *Cæſar-Auguſta* about the year 381. and the firſt Council of *Toledo*, about *A. D.* 400. Laſtly, that the *Communion of Infants* was only *in one kind* either in the *Church* or at home, or that this *Communion of Infants* which the *Council* of *Trent* condemns, was a *due adminiſtration* of the *Euchariſt*: When I ſay you have proved all theſe things, the utmoſt you can hence infer, is, only that in ſome rare caſes, and accidental occaſions, *Communion in one kind* was allowed of. But what is all this to the proving that the *ſtated, ſolemn adminiſtration* of the *Euchariſt in one kind* was ever practiſed, much leſs allowed, within a thouſand years after Chriſt. And yet if you could prove that, you fall ſhort of vindicating your *Church*, unleſs you add this, which you never ſo much as touch at, *viz.* That it was ever in all that time thought lawful to forbid the celebration of the *Euchariſt* in both *kinds*. Prove but this, which is your only proper task, and I ſay as his Lordſhip doth in another caſe, *You ſhall be my Apollo for ever.*

Sozom. hiſt. l. 8. c. 5. Niceph. l. 13. c. 7.

Baron. An. 400. n. 67. Albaſpinæ. obſervat. l. 1. c. 3. Juſtin. Martyr. Apol. 2. Euſeb. hiſt. l. 6. c. 36. Hieron. ep. 4. Nazianz Or. 11. Albaſpinæ. obſ. cap. 4. l. 1. Durant. de ritib. Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 55.

§. 18. We proceed to a fourth error, which is the *Invocation of Saints* defined by the *Council* of *Trent*. As to which, that which his Lordſhip ſaith may be reduced to three things, 1. *That thoſe expreſſions of the Fathers which ſeem moſt to countenance it are but Rhetorical flouriſhes.* 2. *That the Church then did not admit of the Invocation of Saints, but only of the commemoration of Martyrs.* 3. *That the Doctrine of the Roman Church makes the Saints more than Mediators of Interceſſion.* To theſe three I ſhall confine my diſcourſe on this ſubject, and therefore ſhall follow you cloſe in your Anſwers to them. For the firſt, When you are proving that the *Fathers* expreſſions were not *Rhetorical flouriſhes*, you would fain have your

P. 276.

your own accounted ſo. *For*, ſay you, *How can it ſeem to any that duly conſiders it, but moſt extreamly partial and ſtrange to term ſo many exhortations, ſo many plain and poſitive aſſertions, ſo many Inſtances, Examples, Hiſtories, Reports and the like, which the Fathers frequently uſe, and afford in this kind (and that upon occaſions wherein dogmatical and plain delivery of Chriſtian Doctrine and truth is expected) nothing but flouriſhes of wit and Rhetorick?* And after, you call theſe *meer put-offs*, as before you had ſaid, *That when any thing in the Fathers is againſt us, then it is Rhetorick only; when againſt you, then it is dogmatical and the real ſenſe of the Fathers.* But theſe are only General words, fit only to deceive ſuch who believe bold affirmations ſooner than ſolid proofs. This is a thing muſt be tryed by particulars, becauſe it is on both ſides acknowledged, that the *Fathers* did many times uſe their *Rhetorick*, and that ſuch things are uttered by them, in their *Panegyrical Orations* eſpecially, which will not abide a ſevere tryal. Doth not *Bellarmin* confeſs that St. *Chryſoſtom* doth often *hyperbolize*, and *Sixtus Senenſis* ſay as much of others, that in the heat of their diſcourſes they are carried beyond what they would have ſaid in a ſtrict debate? But who are better Judges of theſe things than the *Fathers* themſelves? Are not they the men, who have bid us diſtinguiſh what comes from them in a heat, from that which they deliver as the Doctrine of the *Church*? Have not they told us, that the popular *Orations* uttered in *Churches* are no rules of opinion? Have not ſome of them, when they have ſeemed extream vehement and earneſt, at laſt come off with this, *That they have been declaiming all that while?* Witneſs S. *Hierom* againſt *Helvidius*; and if you make not uſe of the ſame rule to put a favourable conſtruction on his Books againſt *Jovinian*, *Vigilantius*, *Ruffinus* and others, you will as little be able to excuſe him from ſtrange Doctrines, as from intemperate heats. What *put-off* then is it for us to ſay, that S. *Baſil* in his *Oration* on *Mammas*, and the forty eight *Martyrs*; that S. *Gregory Nazianzen* in his *Panegyrical Orations* on S. *Baſil*, S. *Athanaſius*, S. *Cyprian*, his ſiſter *Gorgonia*, S. *Gregory Nyſſen* in his commendation of *Theodorus*, do make uſe of their *Rhetorick* in *Apoſtrophe's* to the perſons whom they praiſe, without any ſolemn Invocation of them? What is there herein unſuitable to their preſent purpoſe? Is it any more than *Orators* have commonly done? What ſtrange thing is it then, that thoſe great *Maſters* of *Rhetorick* ſhould make uſe of their art to raiſe the people, not only to a high eſteem of their perſons, but of thoſe vertues which rendred them ſo illuſtrious? Might not ſuch expreſſions by way of *Apoſtrophe* be ſtill uſed by ſuch who are furtheſt from the *Invocation* of *Saints*? although by their example we are taught how dangerous it is to indulge *Rhetorick* too much in ſuch caſes. But as though they foreſaw the ill uſe would be made of them, they add ſuch expreſſions as ſufficiently tell us, they made no ſolemn Invocation of them; εἴ τις αἴσθοιτο, ὡς οἶμαι, and the like. Had theſe perſons a mind to deliver a Doctrine of *Invocation* of *Saints*, who ſpeak with ſuch *heſitation* and doubt as to their ſenſe of what was ſpoken? (For it is a groundleſs ſhift, to ſay, that thoſe expreſſions imply an affirmation and not doubt.) That which we ſay then, is this, That the Doctrine of the *Church* is not to be judged by ſuch *Encomiaſtick Orations*, wherein ſuch *Rhetorical flouriſhes* are uſual; and when you bring us their plain and poſitive aſſertions, we will by no means give you that Anſwer, That thoſe are *flouriſhes* of *wit* and *Rhetorick*. But his Lordſhip very well knew how far you were from any ſuch dogmatical aſſertions of the *Fathers* in this point, and that the moſt plauſible teſtimonies which you had were taken out of thoſe three great *Orators* in their *Panegyricks* in praiſe of their Friends, or of the *Martyrs*; and therefore it was he ſaid, *Though ſome of the ancient Fathers have ſome Rhetorical flouriſhes about it, for the ſtirring up*

P. 290.

De Miſſa, lib. 2. c. 10.

Sixtus Sen. bibl. Annot. 152. *l.* 6. *Baſil. ep.* 64. *Theodoret. dialog.* 3.

devotion (*as they thought*) *yet the Church then admitted not of the Invocation of Saints.* That is it we ſtand on, that no ſuch thing was admitted by the *Church*, if we ſhould yield that any particular (though great) perſons were too laviſh in their expreſſions this way; muſt theſe be the ſtandard which we muſt judge of the Doctrine of the *Church* by? We muſt conſider the *Church* was now out of perſecution, and eaſe and honour attended that profeſſion of Chriſtianity, for which ſuch multitudes had endured the flames; and the people began to grow more looſe and vain than when they ſtill expected *Martyrdoms:* This made theſe great men ſo highly commend the *Martyrs* in their popular Orations, not to propound them as *objects* of *Invocation*, but as *examples* for their *imitation.* Thence they encouraged them to frequent the *Memoriæ Martyrum*, that by their aſſemblies in thoſe places they might revive ſomething of that priſtine heat of devotion, which was now ſo much abated among them. But the event was ſo far from anſwering their expectation that by this means they grew by degrees to place much of their Religion, rather in honouring the former *Martyrs* and *Saints*, than in ſtriving to imitate them in their vertues and graces. And from the frequenting the places where the *Martyrs* were enſhrined through the pretence of ſome extatical dreams and viſions, or ſome rare occurrences which they ſay happened at thoſe places, they began to turn their real honour into ſuperſtitious devotion, which at laſt ended in ſolemn *Invocation.* To which no ſmall encouragement was given when ſuch perſons as S. *Hierom* and others, were ſo far from putting a ſtop to the growing evil, that though they confeſſed many miſcarriages committed, yet they rather ſought to palliate them and make the beſt conſtruction of them, ſtill hoping that this zeal in the people to the honour of the *Martyrs* would promote devotion among them; whereas it ſunk gradually into greater ſuperſtitions. This I take to be the trueſt and moſt faithful account of thoſe firſt beginnings and tendencies to *Invocation* of *Saints*, which appeared in the latter end of the fourth *Century.*

§. 19. For before that time we meet with nothing that can bear the face of any *poſitive* and *plain aſſertions*, *inſtances*, *examples*, *hiſtories*, *or reports tending that way.* Which is ſo clear, that *Cardinal Perron* after the beſt uſe of his wit and diligence to find out ſomething to this purpoſe within the three firſt *Centuries*, at laſt confeſſes, that in the *Authors* who lived nearer the *Apoſtles* times no footſteps can be found of the *Invocation* of *Saints.* But when he gives this account of it, *That moſt of the writings of that time are loſt*, it makes us ſee what poor excuſes bad cauſes will drive the greateſt wits to. For are not the writings of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius* and others ſtill extant, who were pious and learned men? And is it poſſible that ſuch men ſhould all of them conceal ſuch a Doctrine as this, which would ſo eaſily appear in the face of the *Church?* But it is well we have the confeſſion of ſo great a man for the beſt ages of the *Church*; and not only ſo, but he acknowledges withall, *That there is neither precept nor example for it in the Scripture.* Which others not only aſſert, but offer to give reaſons for it, for the Old Teſtament: *Becauſe the Fathers were not then admitted to the beatifical viſion:* and for the New Teſtament, *Becauſe the Apoſtles were men of ſuch piety and humility, that they would not admit of it themſelves, and therefore made no mention of it in their writings*; *and withall, Becauſe in the beginning of Chriſtianity there would have been a ſuſpicion, that they had only changed the names of Heathen Deities, and retained the ſame kinds of worſhip.* Theſe for the new Teſtament we admit of, not as *Rhetorical flouriſhes*, but as *plain and poſitive aſſertions* which contain a great deal of truth and reaſon in them. So that here is a confeſſed ſilence as to this Doctrine throughout all the ſtory of *Scripture*, and for

Eckius in Enchirid. cap. 5. Salmeron. in 1 Tim. 2. diſp. 8. Pereſ. de Tradit. p. 3.

for 300. years and more after Chriſt; and in all this time we meet with no ſuch *aſſertions*, *inſtances*, *examples*, *reports*, and the like, which tend to eſtabliſh this new Doctrine. But inſtead of this, we meet with very *plain aſſertions* to the contrary, back'd with ſtrong and invincible reaſons; and herein not to inſiſt on thoſe places in *Scripture* which appropriate *Invocation* to *God* only, and that in regard of his incommunicable attributes of *omniſcience*, and *infinite goodneſs* and *power*, which are the only foundations given in *Scripture* for *Invocation*; nor to mention thoſe places, where all tendencies to ſuch kind of *worſhip* of any created Being, are ſeverely checked; and wherein an *Inferior* and relative *worſhip* is condemned on this account, Becauſe *all worſhip is due to God only*; and wherein that very pretence of *humility*, in not coming to *God*, but through ſome Mediator is expreſly ſpoken againſt; nor to inlarge how much this Doctrine of *Invocation* of *Saints* is injurious to *God*, by giving that *worſhip* to creatures which belongs only to himſelf, and how repugnant it is to *Divine worſhip*, that prayers ſhould be made to *Saints* for them to interceed with *God*, when they cannot know what thoſe prayers are till *God* reveals them; nor how diſhonourable it is to *Chriſt*, both in regard of his *merits* and *interceſſion*; nor how great a check it is to true *piety* to put men to pray to them, whom they can have no ground to believe do hear or regard their prayers, and in the mean time to take them off from their ſerious and ſolemn addreſſes to *God*. Not to inſiſt, I ſay, on theſe things, becauſe I deſign no ſet diſcourſe on this ſubject, which hath been ſo amply handled by ſo many already; I ſhall only diſcover the ſenſe of the *Primitive Church* in this particular by two things, the one of which takes in the firſt three Centuries, and the other extends a great deal further: From which I doubt not, but to make it evident how far the *Invocation* of *Saints* was from being received then. The firſt is, from the Anſwers given to the *Heathens*, when it was objected againſt the *Chriſtians* that they did worſhip dead men and Angels. I confeſs, ſome have been ſo ſubtle as from hence to infer *that they did it*; or elſe, ſay they, the *Heathens* would never have charged them with it. But they who read the *Chriſtians Apologies* will find far more unreaſonable things than this laid to their charge, and I hope they will not ſay, there muſt be an equal ground for all the other imputations alſo. But it ſeems they more believe the *Heathens Objections* than the *Chriſtians* Anſwers, who utterly diſavow any ſuch thing. The firſt mention we find of any ſuch imputation, is in that excellent Epiſtle of the *Church* of *Smyrna* to the *Church* of *Philomylium* concerning the Martyrdom of *Polycarp*, wherein they tell us; how ſome ſuggeſted to *Nicetas*, that he ſhould deſire the *Proconſul* that *Polycarp*'s body might not be granted to the *Chriſtians*; *Leſt*, ſay they, *they ſhould leave to worſhip Him that was Crucified, and worſhip him*; to which they return this excellent Anſwer. *They are ignorant that we can never be induced to forſake Chriſt, who ſuffered for the ſalvation of all who ſhall be ſaved of the whole world, or to worſhip any other for him being the Son of God we adore. But the Martyrs as the Diſciples and followers of the Lord, we love worthily for their exceeding great affection toward their own King and Maſter, of whom we wiſh that we may be partners and diſciples.* Can any thing be more expreſs than this is, to ſhew what difference they put between Chriſt and the *Martyrs*? Not that they worſhipped one as *God* with an *abſolute direct worſhip*, and the other as *ſubordinate interceſſors*, with a *relative and indirect worſhip*, as you would have told them; but they *worſhipped Chriſt and none but him*, becauſe he was the *Son of God*; but for the *Martyrs* they *loved* them indeed, but they worſhipped them not at all, for ſo much is implyed in the *Antitheſis* between that and their worſhip of *Chriſt*.

Bellarm. de Sanct. Beatit. l. 1. c. 13.

Ἀγνοοῦσιν ὅτι οὔτε τὸν χριστὸν τοῦτον καταλιπεῖν δυνησόμεθα, ὃν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων σωτηρίας παθόντα, οὔτε ἕτερόν τινα σέβειν. τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ ὑιὸν τοῦ θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν· τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας, ὡς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ μιμητὰς, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου εἰς ἴδιον βασιλέα καὶ διδάσκαλον ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνοὺς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι. Apud Euſeb. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 4. c. 15. ed Valeſ.

Chriſt. So that theſe words are excluſive of any kind of worſhip which they gave to the *Martyrs*; for they were ſo far from giving them that *worſhip* which belonged to the *Son* of *God*, that they only expreſſed their *love* to them, without giving them any *worſhip*. And in the old Latin tranſlation of this Epiſtle, of which there are two *MSS.* extant in *England*; when they ſay, *They can worſhip none elſe but Chriſt*, it is there rendred, *Neque alteri cuiquam precem orationis impendere, Nor impart the ſupplication of prayer to any other*. As the late learned *Lord Primat Uſher* hath obſerved; which utterly deſtroys the Doctrine of *Invocation*.

Anſwer to the Jeſuits Chall. *p.* 426.

§. 20. We proceed further to ſee what account *Origen* gives of the *Chriſtian Doctrine* touching *Invocation* in his Anſwer to *Celſus*, wherein he had ſufficient occaſion given him to declare the ſenſe of the Church at that time. And if he had known or approved any *relative worſhip* given to *Angels* or *Saints*, it is not conceivable that he ſhould expreſs himſelf in ſuch a manner as he doth. For when *Celſus* enquires what kind of *Beings* they thought *Angels* to be, *Origen* anſwers, that although the *Scripture* ſometimes calls them *Gods*, it is not with that intention that we ought to worſhip them. *For*, ſaith he, *all prayers, and ſupplications, and interceſſions, and thankſgivings are to be ſent up to God the Lord of all, by the High-Prieſt who is above all Angels, being the living Word and God. For to call upon Angels (we not comprehending the knowledge of them, which is above the reach of man) is unreaſonable. And ſuppoſing it were granted that the knowledge of them, which is wonderful and ſecret, might be comprehended: this very knowledge declaring their nature to us, and the charge over which every one of them is ſet, would not permit us to preſume to pray unto any other but God the Lord of all, who is abundantly ſufficient for all, by our Saviour the Son of God.*

Πᾶσαν οὖν δέησιν, καὶ προσευχὴν, καὶ ἔντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερέως, ἐμψύχου λόγου καὶ θεοῦ. Ἀγγέλους δὲ καλέσαι μὴ ἀναλαβόντας τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπους θεοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμην, οὐκ εὔλογον. ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑπόθεσιν ἢ θεὸς αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμη, θαυμάσιός τις ἂν εἴη καὶ ἀποῤῥήτου καλυφθῆ. αὕτη ἡ ἐπιστήμη, παραστήσασα τοῖς φύσιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφ' οἷς εἰσιν ἕκαστοι τεταγμένοι ἐάσει ἄλλου δεῖσθαι εὐχεσθαι, ἢ τῷ περὶ πάντα διαρκεῖ (διαρκοῦντι leg. Uſſer.) ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Orig. c. Celſum l. 5. p. 233. ed. Cantab.

In which Teſtimony, we clearly ſee what the judgement of the *Church* then was concerning *Invocation*; For in a matter of *Divine worſhip* equally concerning the whole *Church*, we have no reaſon to imagine that *Origen* ſhould deliver any private opinion of his own. And herein we are plainly told, *That all prayers and ſupplications are to be made to God only through Chriſt*, that in ſuch caſes where we are *Ignorant of the nature of Beings*, it is unreaſonable for us *to pray to them* (as we certainly are concerning ſeparated *ſouls* as well as *Angels*); that in caſe we did know them, yet it would not be reaſonable to pray to them, both becauſe they are inferior and miniſtring *Spirits*, and that *God* himſelf is abundantly ſufficient for all through *Chriſt*. Now let any reaſonable man judge, whether theſe Arguments do not hold as well againſt a *relative and ſubordinate Invocation*, as *abſolute and Soveraign*. But no ſuch diſtinctions were thought of then. For they judged all *Prayer* and *Invocation*, by the very *nature* of it, to import *Divinity* in that it was made to, and therefore that no created *Beings* how excellent ſoever were capable of it. From whence *Origen* afterwards ſuppoſing the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars* to be *Intellectual Beings*, gives this account, *Why, notwithſtanding that, they made no prayers to them. For*, ſaith he, *ſince they offer up prayers themſelves to God through his only Son,* κρίνομεν μὴ δεῖν εὔχεσθαι τοῖς εὐχομένοις, *we judge that we ought not to pray to them that pray. Since they would rather ſend us to God whom they pray to, than bring us down to themſelves, or to divide our praying vertue from God, to themſelves.* Can we then ſuppoſe that the *Church* at that time did allow of prayers to be made to *Saints* in *Heaven*, ſuppoſing their *praying* there in behalf of the *Church* on earth? For we ſee *Origen* goes on this ground, that all *Intellectual Spirits* which pray themſelves, are not to be prayed to; and that if they knew of our *praying* to them, they would

l. 5. p. 233.

ſend

ſend us to *God* and not accept of thoſe *ſupplications* to themſelves which are due only to *God*. In the beginning of the eighth Book, *Celſus* diſputes againſt the *Chriſtians* becauſe they worſhip only the *Supreme God*, without giving any to the *Inferiour Dæmons*; and that upon this ground, becauſe, ſaith he, *They who worſhip the Inferiour Gods, acknowledging them Inferiour, is ſo far from diſhonouring the Supreme, that he doth that which is acceptable to him.* Δίκη πρὸς τὸν σέβων τοὺς ἐκείνους πάντας, ὃ λυπεῖ τὸν θεὸν, ἅ πάντες εἰσί. *For he that honours and worſhips thoſe who are ſubject to him, doth not diſpleaſe God whoſe they are all.* Theſe are *Celſus* his words; from whence we are to take notice, that *Celſus* doth not plead for *abſolute and Soveraign worſhip* to be given to theſe *Inferiour Deities* or *Spirits*; but only a *relative and ſubordinate worſhip*. So that if the Controverſie had been between *Celſus* and a *modern Roman*, all that *Celſus* here ſays muſt have been confeſſed on both ſides, and the whole diſpute only have been concerning thoſe *Dæmons* or *Spirits* which were to have this relative and inferiour kind of *worſhip*, *viz.* Whether thoſe which *Celſus* call'd *Dæmons*, or only the *Bleſſed Spirits* and glorified *Saints*. But *Origen* who went upon other grounds returns a far different Anſwer; *For*, ſaith he, *it is not leſt we ſhould hurt God that we abſtain from the worſhip of any but God according to this word* (ἐκκλινομὲν τὸ δουλεύειν ἄλλῳ πνὶ ἢ τῷ θεῷ, *to render the inferiour worſhip of* δουλεία *to any but God*) *but leſt we ſhould thereby hurt our ſelves, by ſeparating our ſelves from our portion in God.* And the reaſon he gives why *Chriſt* is to be worſhipped is, *from that divinity which manifeſted it ſelf in him, and becauſe of the unity of nature between God and him.* And although *Origen* ſaith, *That in ſome ſenſe we may be ſaid* θεραπεύειν *to give ſome kind of worſhip to Angels and Archangels*; yet he ſaith, *the ſenſe of the word muſt be purg'd, and the actions of the worſhipper reſtor'd.* Yet in the following words he attributes that *worſhip* which is by *ſupplication only to God and his only Son.* So that ſtill he reſerves *the offering up our prayers as the appropriate worſhip to God himſelf, through his only Son. For to him*, ſaith he, *we firſt offer them, intreating him who is the propitiation for our ſins, that he would vouchſafe as our high Prieſt to offer our Prayers, Sacrifices, and Interceſſions to God over all. Therefore our Faith is only in God through his Son, who hath confirmed it to us.* And afterwards, *A man* (ſaith he) *with* Celſus *his Counſel, that we ſhould worſhip* Dæmons (or inferior ſpirits not taking them in the worſt ſenſe) μόνῳ γὰρ προευκτέον τῷ ὅλων θεῷ, *for we muſt only pray to God over all, and to the Word of God, his only begotten, and firſt born of all Creatures; and we muſt entreat him, that he as High Prieſt, would preſent our Prayer, when it is come to him, unto his God, and our God, and unto his Father, and the Father of them that frame their life according to the Word of God.* To the ſame purpoſe again in another place; *To whom we offer our firſt-fruits, to him we direct our prayers, having a High Prieſt, who is entred into Heaven, Jeſus the Son of God; and we hold faſt this confeſſion while we live, through the favour of God, and his Son, who is manifeſted to us:* And after ſaith, *That the Angels help forward their ſalvation, who call upon God, and pray ſincerely, to whom they themſelves alſo pray.* But not one word of any praying to them, but only to God through Chriſt. For as he ſaith elſewhere, *We muſt endeavour to pleaſe God only, who is over all, and pray that he may be propitious to us, procuring his good will with piety, and all kind of virtue. But if he will yet have us to procure the good will of any others, after him*

L. 8. p. 381.

P. 383.

P. 384.

P. 385.

Ἀναπέμπειν θεῷ τὰς εὐχὰς ἐπὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων θεὸν καὶ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τῶν ὅλων ἐπιγνόντας τὸν ἱερέα τῶν ὅλων τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι καὶ τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ. Orig. l. 8. p. 386.

Id. ibid.

Id. p. 395.

Id. p. 400.

Ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεοῖς προσευκτέον καὶ ἱερεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τῶν ὅλων ἐπιγνωστέον καὶ τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεοῖς καὶ πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ. Orig. l. 8. p. 400.

τοῦτον ἵνα εὐκτέον ἐξευμενιζόμενον ἀσεβείᾳ καὶ πάσῃ ἀρετῇ· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλους τινὰς βούλεται ἡμῖν τοὺς ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεοὺς ἐξευμενίζεσθαι θεόν· καλὰ ὑποπάτω ὅτι ὥσπερ τῷ κινδύνῳ παύσαι ἀκολουθεῖ ἡ τῆς σκιᾶς αὐτῆς κίνησις, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τῷ ἐξευμενίζεσθαι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν, ἕπεται ἐξευμενίζειν καὶ ἐκείνους πάντας φίλους ἀγγέλους καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ τὸ εὔμορφον συναίσθησιν ἐν τῶν ἀξίων τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐδαιμονισμοῦ, καὶ οὐ μόνον κατ' αὐτοὺς ἐσομένους ἐν τοῖς ἀξίοις γενέσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπραττομένοις τοῖς βουλομένοις τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν θεραπεύειν, καὶ ἐξευμενίζοντας, καὶ συνευχομένους, καὶ συναγωνιζομένους· ὥστε τολμᾶν ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ἀνθρώπους, ὧν προαιρέσεως προηγουμένοις τὰ κρείττονα, δύνασθαι τῷ θεῷ, μυρίας ὅσας ἀγγέλοις συνεύχεσθαι δυνάμεις ἱερᾶς. Orig. l. 8. p. 420.

that

that is God over all; let him conſider, that as when the body is moved, the motion of the ſhadow doth follow it: ſo in like manner, having God favourable to us, who is over all, it followeth that we ſhall have all his friends, both Angels, and Souls, and Spirits, favourable to us. For they have a ſympathy with them, that are thought worthy to find favour with God. Neither are they only favourable unto ſuch as be worthy; but they co-operate with them alſo that are willing to ſerve God over all; and are friendly to them, and pray with them, and intreat with them. So as we may be bold to ſay, that when men, who with a reſolution, propoſe to themſelves the beſt things, do pray unto God, many thouſands of the Sacred Powers pray together with them uncalled upon. Here indeed we find that *Saints* and *Angels* do interceed in Heaven in behalf of the *Saints* on Earth, but that is not the thing in diſpute between us: but here we find no ſuch thing at all as an *Invocation* of them; but he ſays, *They pray together with us*, when we pray to *God* himſelf, not when we pray firſt to them to *pray* with us. For this *Origen* makes to be wholly needleſs; *for if God be propitious to us, ſo will all the Sacred Powers be too.* So that ſtill we find in *Origen*, that *Invocation* was only to be made to *God* over all, although he ſaith, *That with thoſe who do ſincerely call upon God, the Holy Spirits do joyn with them.* To the ſame purpoſe *Arnobius* ſpeaks, when the *Heathens* asked, Why they did not worſhip any *Inferior Gods? ſatis eſt nobis*, ſaith he, *Deus primus, the Supreme God is ſufficient for us.* In hoc omne quod colendum eſt colimus; quod adorari convenit adoramus, quod obſequium venerationis poſcit, venerationibus promerenur. *In worſhipping him, we worſhip all that is to be worſhipped; we adore all, that is fit to be adored; we procure favour by ſhewing reverence to all that require it.* Where we are ſtill to take notice, that the *Heathens* did not blame them for not giving the higheſt kind of *Worſhip* to theſe *Inferior Deities*, but for not worſhipping them with the *ſubordinate* and *relative Worſhip*, which they ſaid belonged to them. Now when in the Anſwer he ſaith, *That in worſhipping God, they worſhipped all that was to be worſhipped*; he utterly deſtroys any ſuch *Relative Worſhip*, which may be given to Inferior Spirits.

Arnob. l. 3.

§. 21. For we are to conſider, that the *Heathens* themſelves did not give the ſame kind of *Adoration* to their *Heroes*, and *Inferior Deities*, which they did to him whom they accounted *Supreme*. And, ſetting aſide the difference of the object, I can find no poſſible difference between the *Invocation* of *Saints* in the *Church* of *Rome*, and that of *Dæmons* among the *Heathens*. And although *Bellarmin* hath taken the greateſt pains to clear the nature of that *Worſhip*, which is given to *Saints*; yet, upon a thorow examination of it, we ſhall find that all his pleas would have held as well for the Worſhip of *Dæmons* in the *Platoniſts* ſenſe of them, as they do for the worſhip of *Saints* among *Chriſtians*. Three things he tells us *Adoration* conſiſts in, *An Act of Underſtanding* apprehending ſome excellency: *An Act of the Will*, whereby we are inwardly inclined to do ſomething by an internal, or external act, by which we declare our ſenſe of that *excellency*, and our ſubjection to it; and laſtly, *An external Act*, in which we bow or kneel, or ſhew ſome outward ſign of ſubjection. Now of theſe three he ſaith, the *ſecond* is moſt *proper* and *eſſential*, becauſe the firſt may be without *Adoration*, and the laſt with *Iriſion* of that we pretend to worſhip. Further he obſerves that there are ſo many ſorts of *Adoration* or *Worſhip*, as there are degrees of *excellency*, of which he reckons three kinds, *Divine*, *Humane*, and *between both*, as the *Grace* and *Glory* of the *Saints*: and that theſe ſeveral ſorts of Worſhip, according to theſe ſeveral excellencies, are not *univocal*, but *analogical*: and that they may be very well diſtinguiſhed by the *Internal Acts*, for the inclination of the will is greater or leſs, according to the degree of *excellency* apprehended in the object.

Bellarm. de Sanct. beatitu. l. 1. c. 12.

object. But as to the *External Acts*, it is not easie to distinguish them; for, almost all *External Acts*, (*sacrifice* only, and the things referring to it excepted) are common to all kinds of *Adoration*. This is the substance of what he hath, for explaining the nature of *Divine Worship*: And by which I cannot possibly see, but that kind of *Worship* which was given by the *Heathens* to their *Dæmons*, was defensible upon the same grounds that the *Invocation* of *Saints* is now. For as these apprehend a greater excellency in *God*, than in the *Saints*; so did they in the *Supreme God*, than in those *Inferiour Deities*; which they did not acknowledge to have an *Infinite Nature* in themselves, but only that they had the *honour* of being solemnly *worshipped* bestowed upon them. But this will be much clearer in the case of the *Heroes*, or the *Apotheosis* of the *Roman Emperours*, as *Augustus* for instance. The *Roman Senate* decrees, that *Divine Honours* shall be given to *Augustus*: we cannot think, that by virtue of this decree he assumed a *Divine Nature*, or became absolutely *God*, so that the *Act* of the *Understanding* was of the same nature, which it would have been, supposing some *Roman-Catholick* should believe *Augustus* to have been a *Saint*: on which supposition, we will suppose a *Heathen* and *him* to be at their *prayers* together to him. I pray now tell me. Wherein lyes the difference, that one is *Idolatry*, and the other is not? for neither of them suppose him to be the *Supreme God*, both look on him as having a *middle kind of excellency between God and man*, the *external actions* are the same in both, and their apprehensions of excellency being equal, the *inclinations* of their *Wills* to testifie their devotion must be equal too. If you answer me, that one looks on him as a *Saint*, and the other doth not; I may soon tell you, that is nothing to the purpose, for, the Question is not, Whether he was a *Saint* or no, but, Whether the *apprehension* of a *middle excellency* between *Divine* and *Humane*, with a correspondent inclination of the *Will*, testified by external *acts* of *Adoration*, be *Idolatry* or no? If it be *Idolatry* in the one, it must be in the other; for the *ratio formalis* is the same in both, *viz.* the *apprehension* of an *excellency* between *Divine* and *Humane*: for we are not enquiring, Whether the apprehension be true or false, but, What the nature of that *act* of *Religion* is, which is consequent upon such an *apprehension*. Now if it were not *Idolatry* in him, that believed *Augustus* to be a *Saint*, and worshipped him; How can it be made appear to be so in him, that believed him *deified*, or that *Divine Honours* did belong to him? And if this be granted; for my part, I cannot tell how you can excuse the *Primitive Christians*, that would rather suffer *Martyrdom*, than worship the *Heathen Emperours*; for, although they all thought it *Idolatry*, yet upon these principles it could not be so; but the worst that could be made of it, was this, That the *Senate* took that upon it, which it had nothing to do with, because it belonged to the *Pope* to *Canonize* men, and not to the *Roman Senate*. For, let me put it seriously to you, Whether you do not attribute the very same kind of *authority* to the *Pope* now, which the *Roman Senate* challenged in the ἀποθέωσις, of the *Roman Emperours*? For, whosoever will compare the rites of *Canonization* in *Bellarmin* with the ancient rites of the ἀποθέωσις, will find them exactly answering to each other. For, 1. *They are put in a Catalogue of Saints, and must be owned by all for such.* 2. *Invocantur in publicis Ecclesiæ precibus, They are prayed to in the publick prayers of the Church.* 3. *Temples and Altars for their sake, are dedicated to God.* 4. *The sacrifices of the Eucharist, of prayers, and praises, are publickly offered to God for their honour*; and then follow their *Festivals, Images, Reliques, &c.* What was there more done then, that publick *Divine Honours* were made to the *Deified Emperours*; not that these *Honours* were wholly terminated upon them, but they thought the giving of this relative *Honour* to them, did redound to the greater *Honour*

De Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 7.

of the *Supreme Deity?* So that we ſee, a new object of *Divine Worſhip* is ſolemnly appointed, upon the *Popes Canonizing a Saint*; and no pretence can be made to excuſe this from *Idolatry*, which would not have excuſed all thoſe *Heathens* from it, who believed there was one *Supreme Deity*, and yet allowed *Divine Honours* to be given to ſuch *Spirits* which were imployed by him, or attended on him. So that if the notion of *Idolatry* muſt only lye in ſuch an act of the *Will*, which reſults from an apprehenſion of *Infinite excellency*, which is only in the *Supreme Being*; very few, if any, of the more *intelligent Heathens* were ever guilty of it. But if the formal reaſon of their *Idolatry* lay in offering up thoſe *devotions to that which was not God*, which only belong to an *Infinite Being*; I ſee not, but the ſame charge will hold on the ſame grounds, againſt thoſe who *Invocate Saints* with thoſe *external acts of devotion*, which are confeſſed to be the ſame with thoſe wherewith we call on *God*. But nothing can be more unreaſonable, than that *Bellarmin* ſhould except *Sacrifices*, and things belonging thereto, from being common to the firſt and ſecond ſort of *Adoration*, and not except *Invocation*. For, Is it poſſible to conceive any act which doth more expreſs our ſenſe of an *Infinite Excellency*, and the profeſſion of our *ſubjection* to it, than *Invocation* doth? which doth it far more than *Sacrifice* doth; for that being a meer external act, is conſiſtent with the greateſt mockery of *God*; but *ſolemn Invocation* implies in its own nature our dependence upon *God*, and an acknowledgement of his *Infinite Knowledge* and *Power*. For *Invocation* lyes chiefly in the internal *acts*, and denotes primarily the inward deſire of obtaining ſomething from a *Being* above our own: So that, though I ſhould grant the meer *external acts* of *bowing* and *kneeling* to be common to *Adoration* given to *infinite* and *finite perfections*; yet I utterly deny that theſe *acts* are common to both, when the circumſtances do determine the *end* and deſign of them. As no man by the meer bowing of *Abraham* to the *Children* of *Heth* could tell, whether it were civil or divine *Adoration* which he meant; but none who underſtood all the circumſtances of it, would have any reaſon to queſtion it. But, ſuppoſe it had been declared before, that theſe men expected a more than *civil Adoration*, and that all the rites of ſolemn *Invocation* which *Abraham* at any time uſed to *God*, muſt be uſed to them too; then the ſame external *acts* muſt have received a new denomination. So that though the meer *external acts* be common to *civil* and *religious Worſhip*, yet as thoſe *acts* are conſidered with their ſeveral *circumſtances*, they are appropriated to one or the other of them. Thus, though a man may uſe the ſame form of *words* to an *Emperour* on his Throne, and the ſame external *poſture*, which he doth uſe after his death in a *Temple* conſecrated to him; yet in the one they are meerly ſigns of *Civil worſhip*, but in the other they become Teſtimonies of *Religious Adoration*. So, although in the *Invocation* of *Saints*, no other words were uſed, but ſuch as denote them to be *Creatures* ſtill; yet if they be uſed with all the rites of ſolemn *Invocation*, in places appropriate to *Divine Worſhip*, and in *Sacred Offices*, they thereby declare the *Adoration* intended to be greater than any meer creature is capable of. For we muſt conſider, that as *God* is owned to be *Infinite* in himſelf, and to have incommunicable perfections, ſo by reaſon of them there ought to be ſome appropriated acts or ſigns of Worſhip, to declare our ſubjection to him; which being determined for this end, either by the *Law* of *God*, or the *conſent* of people, the attributing of them to any elſe but him, is a publick *violation* of his *honour*. Although in ſo doing, men profeſs that they intend them only as expreſſions of a lower kind of *Worſhip* than is due to the *Supreme Being*. But in ſuch caſes the *proteſtation* avails not, where the fact is evident to the contrary. For when men in the moſt ſolemn manner, in publick places of *devotion*, and in *ſacred offices*, do invocate *Saints*, and yet think they diſhonour not God by it, becauſe they

they ſay, they do not worſhip them as *God*; it is juſt as if a man ſhould upon all occaſions, in the Preſence-Chamber, addreſs himſelf to one of the *King*'s ſubjects as to the *King* himſelf; and being queſtioned for it, ſhould only ſay, he did not diſhonour the *King* by it, becauſe he meant it not to him as a *King*, but as a *Subject*. But by ſo much is the *diſhonour* greater becauſe the *Soveraignty* of the *King* doth require that the rights of *Majeſty* ſhould not be given to any *Subject* whatſoever. So that it is but a vain pretence, when men uſe all the expreſſions whereby we declare our ſenſe of the *Infinite Perfections* which are in *God*, to any *Creatures*, to ſay, *They give them not that Worſhip which belongs to God*, meerly becauſe they do believe they are *Creatures* ſtill. But, Is it poſſible for men to give the honour which is due to *God*, to the *Creatures*, acknowledging them to be *Creatures* ſtill? or, Is it not? If not, then none of the *Heathens* could be guilty of *Idolatry*, in worſhipping *Dæmons*, *Heroes*, and *Deified Emperours*; if it be poſſible, then the acknowledging the *Saints* not to be *God*, cannot excuſe men from the ſame kind of *Idolatry*, in the *Invocation* of them. And it is as frivolous a plea which is made for thoſe forms of *Invocation* which are made to the *Saints* in plain terms, not to intercede with God for them, but to beſtow upon them both temporal and ſpiritual *Bleſſings* (of which multitudes have been produced by our Writers) *viz. That though the form of words be the ſame that is uſed to God, yet the ſenſe is wholly, that they would pray to God to beſtow them.* For, How ſhould any other ſenſe be underſtood, when theſe forms are allowed in *Invocation?* For, although the *Scripture* may ſometimes attribute the effect to the ſubordinate *Inſtrument*, as when S. *Paul* is ſaid *to ſave ſome*, yet certainly the *Scripture* is far from allowing ſuch a liberty in ſolemn *Invocation*: For upon this ground it might have been lawful for men to have fallen down upon their knees to S. *Paul*, and have intreated him to ſave them. Do you think, S. *Paul* would have approved ſuch phraſes in *Invocation?* So that it is not the meer *phraſe*, but as it is joyned with all *rites* of *Invocation*, which makes it look ſo like the moſt groſs *Idolatry*. When you pray to the *Virgin Mary*, *to protect you from your enemies, and receive you in the hour of death*; and to the *Apoſtles*, *to heal your ſpiritual maladies*, which forms are acknowledged by *Bellarmin*; Can any reaſonable man think, that the meaning of them only is, that they would pray to *God* to do theſe things for them? If one ſhould bring his *Petition* to a *Courtier* for his *Pardon*, and in plain terms beg that of him which the *King* only can grant; What man that had his wits about him, would ever imagine that he only meant by it, that he would entreat the *King* to do it for him? But *God* is more jealous of his honour, than to be put off by ſuch *Mockeries* as theſe are: Nay, when your great men at the end of their moſt elaborate works conclude with a *Laus Deo & beatiſſimæ Virgini*, What can be meant by it, but the attributing an *honour* of the ſame kind to the one as the other? And when prayers are made to *Saints*, that through their *merits* they would do ſuch things for them, it is hard conceiving the meaning ſhould only be, that they would pray to *God* for them. Nay, ſome have expreſly ſaid, That *God hath communicated that which of right belonged to him becauſe of his divinity and omnipotency, to the bleſſed Virgin, and the Saints*; *and, that which is more wonderful, to their Images too.* So *Gulielmus Fabricius* in his approbation of *Lipſius* his *Diva Virgo Hallenſis*, which it is thought by ſome that *Lipſius* only writ in imitation of ſome *Heathen Goddeſs*; which may be a very probable account of that otherwiſe very unhappy undertaking of that learned Man. And as one ſaid of the *Pen* he offered to the *Virgin*, *Nothing could be lighter, unleſs it were the Book he wrote with it.* But that profeſſed *Critick* underſtood well enough the exactneſs of the parallel of the *Worſhip* of the *Virgin*

Bell. de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 17.

Poſt Tacitum exactum, conſummatoſq; laborem
Pennam Lipſiades hanc tibi, Diva, dicat.
Nil potuit pennâ levius tibi Diva dicare,
Ni foret levius quod tibi ſcribit opus.

Mary, with that of the *Heathen Goddeſſes*; and therefore very ſuitably calls her *Tutelaris Diva*, by which his meaning might be gueſſed at, as *Plato*'s was, by his uſing the name of *God*, or *Gods*. But however that be, we are ſure the parallel is ſo great between the worſhip of *Saints* in the *Church* of *Rome*, and that of *Heroes* and *Dæmons* amongſt the *Heathens*, that if one be juſtified, the other cannot be condemned, and if one be condemned, the other cannot be juſtified. So that from hence it follows, that the arguments uſed by the *Primitive Chriſtians* againſt that Worſhip, will hold againſt *Invocation of Saints*; becauſe the *Heathens* pleaded not for an *abſolute* and *ſoveraign Worſhip* of them, but only ſuch a kind of *relative* and *ſubordinate Worſhip*, as you profeſs to be due to *Saints*. Thus much may ſuffice to clear the notion of *Worſhip* in the *Primitive Church*, and to ſhew, how far that was from approving your Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*.

§. 22. *Athanaſ. Orat. 4. Cont. Arrian. Greg. Nyſſen. Orat. 4. Cont. Eunom. Novatian. de Trin. c. 14.*

The next Argument I intended to have inſiſted on, ſhould have been the proving the *Divinity of Chriſt* from the *Invocation* of him, as *Athanaſius* and ſeveral others do; which could ſignifie nothing, if *Invocation* were then allowed to *Saints*. But this hath been ſo amply managed by others, and the ſenſe of the *Church* having been ſufficiently diſcovered by our precedent diſcourſe; I ſhall not need to inſiſt any more on thoſe foregoing times, but now come to that age of the *Church*, wherein the honour of the *Martyrs* ſeems to be advanced higher upon the ceaſing of *perſecution*. But ſtill his Lordſhip ſaith, *That the Church then admitted not of the Invocation of Saints, but only of the Commemoration of the Martyrs, as appears clearly in* S. Auguſtine, *who ſaith, Although they be at the Sacrifice named in their order,* non tamen à Sacerdote qui ſacrificat invocantur: *they are not invoked by the Prieſt who ſacrifices.* Now to this you anſwer, *The Father's meaning is, that the Saints departed are not invocated, or call'd upon by way of Sacrifice,* i. e. *as perſons to whom the Sacrifice is offered; which, you ſay, is a work of Religion due to God only:* and this you prove was all that S. *Auſtin* meant, *becauſe in other places of his works, where he teaches, that not only Commemoration is made of the Saints departed in time of Sacrifice, but that it is done to this particular intent and purpoſe,* viz. *that they would pray for us; which doubtleſs amounts to a virtual Invocation of them.* And for this you produce *ſeveral paſſages out of his works.* Two things therefore muſt be enquired into. 1. What the meaning of S. *Auſtin* is, when he ſaith, *That the Saints are not invocated at the Sacrifice.* 2. What his meaning is, in thoſe places wherein he allows of that you call *Virtual Invocation,* viz. *that the Saints would pray for us.* 1. We are to enquire, What S. *Auſtin*'s meaning is, when he ſaith, That the *Saints* are not invocated at the *Sacrifice*; *meaning no other,* (ſay you) *but the Sacrifice of the Maſs, which you hope the Reader will mark for* S. Auſtin's *ſake*; wherein you betray moſt egregious ignorance or fraud, if you either ſuppoſe the *Chriſtians* called nothing elſe a *Sacrifice* at that time, but what you now call the *Maſs*, or that they did it in the ſame reſpect that you do now. A *Sacrifice* of *Prayer* and *Praiſe* indeed they had, and a *Commemoration* of *Chriſts Sacrifice* in the *Lords Supper*, but no ſuch thing as a *propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead*; and I pray mark this for your own ſake. But for our better underſtanding S. *Auſtin*'s meaning, we muſt conſider that he is there comparing the *honours* which the *Heathens* gave to their *Heroes*, with thoſe which the *Chriſtians* give to the *Martyrs*. *They,* ſaith he, *to thoſe Gods of theirs, build Temples, erect Altars, appoint Prieſts, and offer Sacrifices; but we do not build any Temples to the Martyrs as to gods, but raiſe Sepulchres as to dead men, whoſe ſpirits live with God; neither do we build Altars, at which we may ſacrifice to the Martyrs, but we offer up a Sacrifice only to the God of the Martyrs, and of us; at which Sacrifice,* ſaith he,

Aug. de Civit. Dei. l. 22. c. 10. P. 291.

he, *as holy men of God, who through their confeſſion of him have overcome the world, they are named in their place and order, but are not invocated by the Prieſt, who offers up the Sacrifice.* Two things may here be underſtood by the *Sacrifice*, either the *anniverſary Sacrifice of praiſe to God*, on the day of their *Natalitia* or *Martyrdoms*; or elſe the *celebration* of the *Euchariſt*, which was wont to be done at the *memoriæ Martyrum* chiefly upon that *anniverſary day*. Now there are many reaſons to incline me to think that St. *Auſtin* doth not ſpeak of any ordinary celebration of the *Euchariſt*, but of that anniverſary *ſolemnity*, which was wont to be kept at the *tombs* of the *Martyrs* on the day of their *ſufferings*. Chiefly becauſe S. *Auſtin* is here paralleling the *honours* of the *Martyrs*, with thoſe of the *Heathen Heroes*; and therefore it was reaſon he ſhould ſpeak of the greateſt *ſolemnities* which were uſed for them. Now it is certain that there were ſuch *anniverſary dayes* then kept (by many paſſages of thoſe times, and ſomewhat before them) eſpecially in the *African Churches*; and at theſe they offered up *ſolemn prayers and praiſes to God*. Both which are clear from this paſſage of S. *Cyprian*, *Sacrificia pro iis ſemper ut meminiſtis offerimus, quoties Martyrum paſſiones & dies anniverſariâ Commemoratione celebramus:* Where we find an *anniverſary Commemoration* and *Sacrifices* offered at them. What theſe *Sacrifices* were, *Rigaltius* in his *Obſervations* on that place tells us; *Chriſtiani*, ſaith he, *ſacris anniverſariis, laudes Deo dicunt, commemoratis eorum nominibus qui pro fide Chriſto dicta Martyrium fortiter obierunt.* So that the *Sacrifice* was a *Sacrifice* of *praiſe* to *God* in behalf of the *Martyrs*. At which they had their *Orationum Sacrificia* too, as *Tertullian* calls them, who ſaith, *Under the Goſpel the pure Sacrifice is Prayer to God; and that the ſinner being cleanſed, ought to offer to God*, munus apud Templum, orationem ſcil. & gratiarum actionem apud Eccleſiam per Jeſum Chriſtum Catholicum Patris Sacerdotem, *a Sacrifice in his Temple*, viz. *prayer and praiſe in his Church through Jeſus Chriſt the Catholick High Prieſt of his Father.* Hence S. *Cyprian*, *Quando in Sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus*, which *Rigaltius* explains by the *publick prayers, which the Prieſt made for the people, and underſtands it wholly of the Sacrifices of prayers.* So that theſe ſolemn thankſgivings to *God* in behalf of the *Martyrs*, and the *prayers* which were made for others, are thoſe *Sacrifices* which did belong to theſe anniverſary *ſolemnities*, *Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus.* Thoſe *oblationes pro natalitiis*, were nothing elſe but theſe ſolemn Euchariſtical *Sacrifices* in behalf of the *Martyrs ſufferings*, which were called their *Natalitia*. Now to apply this to S. *Auſtin*: among the *honours* belonging to the *Martyrs*, he mentions the *Sacrifice* which was offered to *God* in Commemoration of them, and, What can this be other than on that *anniverſary ſolemnity* which *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* mention, that was daily kept on that account? Now at this *Sacrifice*, ſaith he, *they are named in their order, but not invocated.* Which being underſtood of the anniverſary day, and of the *Sacrifices* of *prayers* and *praiſes*, nothing can be more expreſs againſt *Invocation* of *Saints*, than this place is. For, if ever they were ſolemnly *invocated*, it certainly would be on the day of the great ſolemnity for them; and if then all *prayers* and *praiſes* were looked on as due only to *God*, as *Sacrifices* belonging to him, then it cannot but be a robbing *God* of his *honour*, to offer up either *prayers* or *praiſes* to any but himſelf. But, becauſe it was the cuſtom at thoſe ſolemnities, to have the *Euchariſt* adminiſtred, and that S. *Auſtin* afterwards mentions this, I ſhall not exclude the *Euchariſt* here, yet that *Sacrifice* may ſtill comprehend all the *ſupplications* which were then uſed; and if the *Saints* were not *invocated* then, we have reaſon to conclude they were not at all. For the *Commemoration* of the *Martyrs* was made after the *Ite, miſſa eſt*, and the *Catechumens* were departed; ſo that there was no

Cyprian. ep. 34. p. 53.

Rigalt. obſ. ad Cyprian. p. 50.

Tertull. c. Marcion. l. 3. p. 497. l. 4. p. 502.

P. 512. Ed. Rigalt. Cypr. ep. 15.

Tertull. de Coron. Militis c. 3.

ſuch

ſuch occaſion for their *Invocation* at any other time, as then. So that if there were no *Invocation* of them at the *Sacrifice*, much leſs was there out of it; ſince all the *ſolemnities* concerning the *Martyrs* were uſed in the time of *Celebration*. Thus we ſee, this place of S. *Auſtin* is full and clear againſt *Invocation* of *Saints*, and we muſt now enquire into what he ſaith elſewhere. Only we take notice here, that S. *Auſtin* not only appropriates *Sacrifices* as a thing peculiar to *God*, but *Temples* and *Altars* too. And that *Sacrifice* which was then appropriated to *God*, was not a *propitiatory Sacrifice*, but *Euchariſtical* and *ſupplicatory*; and by conſequence, if Sacrifice only belongs to God, then all *Thankſgiving* and *Invocation* doth too. For both thoſe, we ſee, were comprehended by the *African Fathers* under the notion of *Sacrifice*.

§. 23. We proceed now to enquire, what S. *Auſtin* ſaith elſewhere; *Whether he doth any where elſe allow Invocation as due to Saints?* For which we muſt conſider that S. *Auſtin* every where appropriates all acts of *Religion* only to *God*; for he expreſly ſaith, *That we muſt only ask of God that good which we hope to do; that God alone muſt be ſerved by the ſoul, becauſe he alone is the Creator of it: and that every glorified rational creature, is only to be loved and imitated; that we ought not to apply our Religion to yield ſervice to the dead; that they muſt be honoured for imitation, not worſhipped for Religion. That Religion is nothing elſe but the Worſhip of God, and therefore we ought not to conſecrate our ſelves to any thing elſe, by any Religious rites. That thoſe who have gone to Angels, inſtead of God, have fallen into many illuſions, and deceitful fancies.* Now is it conceivable, that a perſon conſtant to himſelf, ſhould ſo often, and on ſuch good grounds aſſert, that all *Acts* of *Religion* belong only to *God*, and yet withal aſcribe religious *Invocation* as due either to *Saints* or *Angels*? But we muſt further conſider, that the ground of S. *Auſtin*'s diſtinguiſhing between Λατρεία and Δουλεία, was not to aſſert different degrees of *religious worſhip*, but to make different kinds of *worſhip* of thoſe two; the one being properly *religious* worſhip, the other only *cultus dilectionis & ſocietatis*, as he calls it, *a worſhip only of love and reſpect*. So that we quarrel not with the diſtinction it ſelf, but with your miſapplying it. *For S.* Auſtin *plainly makes the honour given to Saints departed, to be of the ſame nature with that which is given them, while they live: all the difference is*, ſaith he, *we may render that honour to them with the more confidence, after they have overcome.* But ſtill adds, *That all religious worſhip is proper only to God.* The only difficulty then is, What is to be underſtood by thoſe other paſſages you produce out of him. And this we have gained already, that they cannot be underſtood of any *religious worſhip*, without an apparent contradiction. Your firſt Citation is, *That the commemoration of Martyrs at the Holy Table, is not that we ſhould pray for them, but rather that they ſhould pray for us.* To the ſame purpoſe the ſecond is, *That it is an injury to pray for a Martyr, to whoſe prayers we our ſelves ought to be recommended.* The only things which can be drawn from hence are, that the *Martyrs* do pray for the *Church* on earth, and that we ought to recommend our ſelves to their prayers: But what is this to an Invocation of them, when it doth not ſo much as imply a direct deſire of them to pray for us? When this recommending our ſelves to the prayers of the *Martyrs*, is probably underſtood of nothing elſe, but a deſire that *God* would hear the *prayers* which the *Saints* in *Heaven* do make on our behalf, without any addreſs to the *Martyrs* themſelves, that they would pray for us. Which ſeems very unreaſonable, without good aſſurance that they did hear or underſtand thoſe requeſts of that nature which are made to them. It is not therefore the ſaying that *the Saints do pray for us*, which makes it either *lawful or profitable* for us to pray to them.

S. Auguſtin. Epiſtol. c. 114. De quantitate animæ, c. 34. De civit. Dei, l. 8. c. 27. l. 10. c. 1. q. 3. Ep. 163. Confeſſ. l. 10. c. 42.

Colimus ergo Martyres in cultu dilectionis & ſocietatis, quo & in hîc vitâ coluntur Sancti homines Dei. Cont. Fauſtum, l. 20. c. 21.

Tract. 84. in Johan. De verbis Ap. ſerm. 17. (not) 24.

For

For ſince they aſcribe that *honour* as alone due to *God*, ſo ought we to do too; and I can hardly ſee how the very praying to *Saints* to pray for us, being performed with all the rites of *ſolemn* and *Religious Invocation*, can be excuſed from attributing that *honour* to the *creature* which is due only to the *Creator*. And therefore I cannot but wonder at thoſe who would make this only of the ſame nature, with our deſiring *Fellow-Chriſtians* to pray for us. For is there no difference between a mans intreating a *Courtier* to preſent his Petition to the *King*, and his falling down on his *Knees* to him with all the ceremony due to the *King* himſelf; and then put it off, with ſaying, that in all that, he only deſired him to ſue to his *Majeſty* in his behalf? Although therefore we condemn not the ſolemn praying to *God*, not only to hear the prayers of the *Church Militant*, but of that part of it which is *triumphant* in behalf of the other in *General*; yet this falls far ſhort of ſolemn *addreſſes* in places of *Divine worſhip*, and in *Sacred offices* to the *Saints*, that they would pray for us. This is it, which as to that you call *virtual Invocation*, you ſhould have proved out of S. *Auſtin*; and yet even that falls much ſhort of that *direct* and *formal Invocation* which is both uſed and allowed in the *Church* of *Rome*. But you offer at a further proof of a direct *ora pro nobis* in S. *Auſtin*. *For* (ſay you) *S.* Auſtin *doth profeſs it to be the General cuſtom of Chriſtians in their recommending themſelves to the Saints, to ſay*, Memor eſto noſtrî; *which ſurely no man will contend to ſignifie leſs than* ora pro nobis. I grant, it ſignifies as much where S. *Auſtin* uſes it; but if you had conſulted the place, you might eaſily have ſeen how wholly impertinent it is to your purpoſe. For S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks not at all there of *Saints* departed, but of them *living*; and that it was a common thing among *Chriſtians* to ſay to any one of them *Memor eſto mei*, Remember me in your prayers; which appears by the whole ſcope of that *Chapter*, where he ſpeaks of giving *alms*, and the effect of them on thoſe who received them in making them mindful of them. It cannot be denyed, but ſome of them did uſe ſuch expreſſions to thoſe who were near their *Martyrdom*; but ſtill this only ſhews the reqneſting it of them, when they were ſure they heard them; but it proves not any ſolemn *Invocations* of them when they were dead. But if we ſhould grant, that there are expreſſions intimating a *deſire* that *Saints* in Heaven ſhould pray for them, which is the utmoſt you can make of the citation out of the *Sermon* on S. *Stephen* (which with the reſt *de Sanctis* is vehemently ſuſpected and the other on *Job* is counterfeit) yet there is a great deal of difference to be put between ſuch a calling upon *Martyrs* (of whom only S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks) out of a deſire of their prayers; and a ſolemn and direct praying to them in the moſt *Sacred offices* and *publick devotions:* which is uſed and approved in your *Church*. For whatever there might be of *private devotion* (not to call it *ſuperſtition*) this way in S. *Auſtin*'s time, in deſiring the *prayers* of *departed Saints* whom they could have no ground at all to believe they heard them; yet you can bring no evidence of any *uſe* of this in the *publick offices* of the *Church*, much leſs of that direct *Invocation*, which we moſt of all charge your *Church* with. That then which began in meer *hypothetical addreſſes*, went ſomewhat further, when they began to grow more confident that in ſome extraordinary way or other the *Saints heard* them; but ſtill this kept it ſelf within the bounds of the *cultus dilectionis & ſocietatis*, that *reſpect* which aroſe from *Love and Communion*; but it was a good while after before it obtained a place in the *publick Offices*, and yet longer, before it came to that height of *Religious Invocation*, which is more practiſed than pleaded for in the *Church* of *Rome*. For although great endeavours be uſed to ſmooth over theſe groſs abuſes with fair diſtinctions of *relative and abſolute, direct and indirect worſhip*; yet the general practice is uncapable of being *palliated* by theſe narrow coverings,

De civit. Dei, l. 21. c. 27.

there

there being the moſt *formal* and *direct Invocations* uſed to *Saints* for ſpiritual and temporal bleſſings. Which being allowed of in common practice and the moſt *ſacred Offices*, can never be excuſed from as great *Idolatry* as the Heathens were guilty of, in the worſhip of their *Inferiour Deities*. I conclude this therefore with that of *Spalatenſis*, *Religious Invocation* of *Saints* is *Heatheniſm*; *and meer civil Invocation of them*, though not ſo bad, is yet *dangerous*. And therefore *Wicelius* juſtly ſaith, *That the Invocation of Saints, is to be caſt out of the Church, becauſe it aſcribes Gods honour and attributes to his creatures, and derogates from the office and glory of Chriſt by making Saints, Mediators and Interceſſors.*

Spalat. oſtend. err. *Suarez. c. 2. ſect. 20.* *Wicel. via regia de Invocat. Sanct.*

§. 24. Pag. 276. Which is that we now come to conſider. For, as his Lordſhip ſaith, *When the Church prayed to God for any thing, ſhe deſired to be heard for the mercies and the merits of Chriſt, and not for the merits of any Saints whatſoever. For I much doubt, this were to make the Saints more than Mediators of Interceſſion, which is all that you will acknowledge you allow to the Saints. For I pray, is not by the Merits more than by the Interceſſion? Did not Chriſt redeem us by his merits? And if God muſt hear our prayers for the merits of the Saints, how much fall they ſhort of ſharers in the mediation of Redemption? Such prayers as theſe the Church of* Rome *makes at this day, and they ſtand (not without great ſcandal to Chriſt and Chriſtianity) uſed and authorized to be uſed in the Miſſal.* To this P. 292. you Anſwer in two things. 1. *That ſuch prayers as theſe, are uſed in Scripture.* 2. *That they are no derogation to the merits of Chriſt.* For the firſt, you ſay, *Solomon*, Pſal. 132. *prays to God to hear him, in effect for the merits of his Father* David *deceaſed, when he ſaith*, Memento, Domine, David & omnis manſuetudinis ejus, *Lord remember* David *and all his meekneſs, &c. This* (you ſay) *cannot be underſtood of Gods Covenant and promiſe made to* David (*as Proteſtants vainly pretend*) *but of* Davids *piety and vertue by which he was acceptable to God. For which reaſon he adds again, For thy ſervant* Davids *ſake turn not away the face of thine Anointed. The like was done by* Daniel, Moſes, Hieremias *and other Prophets praying unto God, and deſiring their petitions might be heard for* Abraham, *for* Iſaac, *for* Iſraels *ſake, and for the ſakes of other Holy men, who had lived before, and been in their times perſons acceptable to God.* And for this you quote St. *Auſtin* and *Chryſoſtome*. So far you have very fairly rendred *Bellarmin* exactly in *Engliſh*. But we are yet to ſeek, Why all thoſe expreſſions in *Scripture* are not to be underſtood of the *Covenant* and *Promiſe God* made with thoſe perſons who are mentioned by you. For it is conſiderable, that you inſtance in none but ſuch whom *God* had made an expreſs *Covenant* with, as with the *Patriarchs*, and with *David*. But ſince you ſay, *That this Anſwer hath not the leaſt ground from the Text*, therein you out do *Bellarmin*, and ſpeak that which the Text evidently contradicts you in. For *Pſal.* 132. 11. next after thoſe very words, *For thy ſervant* David's *ſake*; it follows, *The Lord hath ſworn in truth unto* David; and, in the following verſe, the Covenant God made with *David* is mentioned. *If thy Children will keep my Covenant and my Teſtimony that I ſhall teach them, their Children alſo ſhall ſit upon thy throne for evermore.* You had then much conſulted the Text when you ſay, *This expoſition had not the leaſt ground from it*; for that ſpeaks expreſly of the *Promiſe and Covenant which God made with* David. And what you add to the text, *of* Davids *piety and vertue*, we may more juſtly ſay, *hath not the leaſt ground from it.* For the word doth not ſignifie *meekneſs* but *affliction*, and therefore *Aquila* renders it κακωχίας, *Symmachus* κακώσεως, and ſome old *Copies* ταπεινώσεως, all referring not to *Davids merits*, but to his *ſufferings*. And it is not improbably conceived by ſome, that this *Pſalm* is not of *Solomons* penning, but of *Davids*; and that at the time when the *Ark* was to be brought back from the *Houſe* of *Obed Edom* to *Hieruſalem*. And in all

De Sanct. beatitud. l. 1. c. 19.

thoſe

thoſe other places of *Scripture* mention'd, referring to *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*; the *Scripture* is very plain, that they are to be underſtood of the *Covenant God* made with them: As appears by the very words of *Moſes*, *Remember* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Iſrael *thy ſervants, to whom thou ſwareſt by thine own ſelf*, &c. And *God* himſelf ſpeaks often *of his remembring his Covenant which he made with* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob; and that is the ground why the *Prophets* afterwards plead the remembrance of thoſe perſons, becauſe the *Covenant* made with them was the foundation of all thoſe bleſſings which the *Children* of *Iſrael* expected afterwards. The utmoſt that can be made of St. *Auguſtins* teſtimony is, *That God may ſometimes ſhew favour to a people that hath deſerved ill at his hands for the ſake of ſuch as pray for them*; as he did to the people of *Iſrael* for the ſake of *Moſes*. And all that St. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, is, *That God may ſhew mercy to wicked men for the ſake of their righteous Anceſtors who are dead.* But this is no no more than he hath promiſed, That he will ſhew mercy to them that love him to the third and fourth *Generation.* But there is a great deal of difference to be made between the expreſſions of *Gods bounty* and the *Foundation* of our *prayers*; which ought to be only a *promiſe* of *God.* And in this caſe we deny it not to be lawful, to pray that *God* would remember his promiſe: but that is a quite different thing from *praying* that we may receive bleſſings through the merits of the *Saints* in Heaven. So that it cannot be hence concluded, that 'tis no unwarrantable thing to pray that *God* would hear us for the *merits* of the *Saints*.

Exod. 32. 13. Exod. 6. 5, 8. Levit. 26. 42. 45.

Aug. in Exod. queſt. 49.

Chryſoſt. hom. 42. in Gen. hom. 27. in Matth.

But this will be further explained now we come to ſee, how you vindicate this from being any derogation to the *merits* of *Chriſt*. *We believe*, ſay you, *and confeſs that Chriſt alone is our Redeemer; and that he, and none but he, by the juſt price of his moſt precious blood, hath paid our ranſome, and fully ſatisfied the juſtice of God for our ſins: all that we deſire of the Saints, either when we mention their merits to God, or ſimply beg their Interceſſion with God for us, is only, that they would join with us in prayer to God, and that God would be pleaſed for their ſakes, whoſe works were ſo grateful to him; to beſtow on us the favours we ask.* When things are ſo odious in the practice of them, that they cauſe all perſons of any ingenuity among your ſelves to cry out upon them, then your *Arts* are, To let the ſame practices continue ſtill, but to find out ſome plauſible pretext to colour them over with. As it is here in the buſineſs of *praying to Saints*, and making them thereby to be *Mediators* between God and us; which implying ſo great diſhonour to the all-ſufficiency of the *Merits* and *Interceſſion* of *Chriſt*, you are fain to find out the faireſt excuſes you can make for it, although the practices ſtill continue which overthrow all the diſtinctions you uſe. Thus it is plain, that *direct* and *formal prayers* in your *Church* are made to *Saints*; but, you ſay, *theſe are only to intreat them to pray for us*: You pray expreſly (as his Lordſhip tells you) *That God by the merits and prayers of Saints would deliver you from the fire of Hell; that you may obtain the glory of eternity by their merits; and that God would abſolve you from your ſins by their interceding merits*: and yet for all this, you would have us believe, that you offer no derogation at all to the *Merits* and *Interceſſion* of *Chriſt*. But is it not the great honour of *Chriſt* that his *Merits* and *Interceſſion* alone are *all-ſufficient* to procure all ſpiritual *bleſſings* for us? And can any ſpiritual bleſſings be greater than deliverance from hell, eternal glory, and the forgiveneſs of ſins? And when you pray for all theſe through the *Merits* of the *Saints*, how can you poſſibly more diſparage the *all-ſufficiency* of the *Merits* of *Chriſt*? For, if thoſe be ſufficient what need any more? Will *God* grant that for the *Merits* of the *Saints*, which he would not do for the *Interceſſion* of *Chriſt*? Or, do we want the *Merits* of the *Saints* to apply the *Merits* of *Chriſt*? but ſtill ſomething

§. 25.

P. 293.

P. 277.

of weakneſs and defect muſt be implyed in them, if ſome further additional *Merits* be wanting for the application of the former. If a *Prince* ſhould declare to ſome of his *Fathers* Subjects, that he would ſatisfie his *Fathers* diſpleaſure, and intercepe for them that they ſhould have an abſolute pardon; Would it not argue a diſtruſt of the *Princes* Intereſt to ſollicite ſome *Inferiour Attendants* to intreat the *King* to pardon them for their *ſakes?* And it is here a plain caſe, whatever you pretend, that you do not only pray that the *Saints* would joyn in prayer to *God* with you, but you run to them for *help and aſſiſtance*, in order to the obtaining the greateſt ſpiritual bleſſings from *God*. For ſo the *Council of Trent* expreſly defines, *That it is not only good and profitable to Invocate the Saints, but ob beneficia impetranda à Deo per Chriſtum ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere; for the obtaining of bleſſings from God through Chriſt, we ought to fly to their prayers, help and aſſiſtance.* If nothing elſe were meant, but only that the *Saints* ſhould pray for us, What means *help* and *aſſiſtance* mentioned as diſtinct from their prayers? And the *Roman Catechiſm* more fully delivers it (which was publiſhed by order of the *Council* of *Trent*) *viz. That Saints are not only to be invocated, becauſe of their prayers to God, but becauſe God beſtows many bleſſings on us*, eorum merito & gratiâ, *by their merits and favour*; and after adds, *Rogati & peccatorum veniam impetrabunt, & conciliabunt nobis Dei gratiam; Being asked, they will obtain the pardon of ſin, and procure for us the favour of God.* And, What can be more ſaid concerning *Chriſt* himſelf? Although therefore you ſay never ſo much, *That your prayers are made to the Saints through the merits of Chriſt*, and that you conclude all your *prayers, per Chriſtum Dominum noſtrum*; yet all this cannot clear you from offering the greateſt diſhonour to the *merits* and *interceſſion* of *Chriſt*, ſince it is plain you rely on the *Saints merits*, in order to the obtaining the *Bleſſings* you pray for. *But*, ſay you, *If the Saints being rewarded in Heaven for their merits, be not injurious to the fulneſs of Chriſts merits, Why ſhould their being heard by virtue of thoſe merits, when they pray to God for us through Chriſt, or our deſire that they may be heard for them, be thought injurious to Chriſts merits?* To which I anſwer, Thoſe *merits* which you ſuppoſe in *Saints*, when they are rewarded in Heaven, have either an *equal* proportion with the *reward* they receive, or not? If not, then they ceaſe to be merits, and the giving the reward, (though an act of *Juſtice*, the Promiſe ſuppoſed) yet in it ſelf is wholly an act of *Grace* and *Favour*; if they have, then the full recompence is received by that *reward*, and nothing further can be obtained for others on their account. But in the ſenſe it is to be ſuſpected you take *merits* in, we as well aſſert, that the proportioning the *reward* in Heaven to the *merits* of *Saints*, is injurious to the *fulneſs* of *Chriſts merits*, as their obtaining mercies for others by reaſon of them. Only this latter adds to the diſhonour, in that there is not only ſuppoſed a *proportion* between Heaven and them; but, as though that were not enough, a further *efficacy* is attributed to them, for obtaining *mercies* for others too. His Lordſhip therefore does not *go about to pervert the ſenſe of the prayers uſed in your Miſſal*; but the plain words and ſenſe of them evidently ſhew, how contrary they are to Chriſtian Doctrine and Piety. *Bellarmin*'s ſaying, that the *Saints* may in ſome ſenſe be called our *Redeemers*, cannot be vindicated by that ſaying of S. *Paul*, That *he became all things to all men, that he might ſave ſome*; becauſe *ſalvation* reſpects the *effect* of *Chriſts death*, the promotion of which may in ſome ſenſe be attributed to the *Inſtruments* of it, ſuch as S. *Paul* was here on Earth; but *Redemption* reſpects the *merits* by which that effect was obtained, and ſo belongs wholly to *Chriſt*, and cannot be attributed to any *Saints*, either in Earth or Heaven. When you can prove that any ſubordinate *Inſtruments* of *Gods Power* are

Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. ult.

Catech. Rom. p. 3. p. 504.

Ibid.

1 Cor. 9. 23.

are called *Numina*, you may then excuſe *Bellarmin* for calling the *Saints* ſo; but that is ſo incongruous a ſenſe of the word, that it needs no confutation.

§. 26. We are now come to the *laſt Errour*, which his Lordſhip here charges your pretended *General Councils* with, which is, concerning *Adoration* of *Images*. *Of which*, his Lordſhip ſays, *That the Ancient Church knew it not. And the Modern Church of* Rome *is too like to Paganiſm, in the practice of it; and driven to ſcarce intelligible ſubtilties in her ſervants writings that defend it. And this, without any care had of millions of ſouls, unable to underſtand her ſubtilties, or ſhun her practice.* Here you ſay, *The Biſhop is very bitter*; but no more than the nature of the thing required. All the Anſwer you return to this, lyes in theſe things. 1. *That the Church of* Rome *teaches nothing concerning the Worſhip of Images, but what the ſecond Council of* Nice *did nine hundred years ago; which is, that they muſt be had in Veneration, and due Reverence, but not have Divine Worſhip given to them.* 2. *That Images were in common Uſe and Veneration too, among Chriſtians in the Ancient Church.* 3. *That what abuſes are crept in, are not to be imputed to the Church, but to particular perſons.* This is the ſubſtance of what you ſay to the end of the *Chapter*; as to which a brief Anſwer will ſuffice, becauſe I deſign not a full handling the Queſtion of the *worſhip* of *Images*. If that which you ſay in the *firſt place*, be true, it doth the more prove that which his Lordſhip intends, *viz.* that not *one* barely, but *two* of thoſe you own to be *General Councils*, have erred in this particular. If either thoſe *Councils*, or you, had intended to have dealt fairly and honeſtly with the world, they and you ſhould have declared, what that *Veneration* and *Reverence* is, which is *due* to Images; What difference you put between that, and the *Worſhip* due to *God*; and, Whether the ſame pretences and excuſes would not as well have juſtified the *Pagan Idolatries?* For this was it which his Lordſhip charged you with, that you came too near *Paganiſm* in your practice. But as to this you anſwer nothing, but that if you do, ſo did the Council of *Nice* too: But, Is that a ſufficient excuſe for you? It is well enough known, What kind of *Council* that was; How much it was oppoſed by the *Synod* of *Frankford*, How many perſons both in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, declared themſelves againſt the *Doctrine* of it? But, What a pitiful plea is it for you to ſay, *That the Council of* Trent *had ſilenced all calumnies, by ſaying, That you attribute no Divinity to the Images, but only worſhip them with ſuch honour and reverence as is due to them?* Would not any conſiderate *Heathens* have ſaid as much as this is? But, the Queſtion is, Whether that *Veneration* of them which is uſed by you towards Images, be *due* to them, or no? This you ſhould have undertaken, and ſet the diſtinct *limits* between the *worſhip* due to *God*, and that which is given to theſe. You ſhould have proved, that this is no prohibited way of *worſhip*; for, if it be, it can in no ſenſe be *due* to them. For, ſince *God* may determine the *modes* of his own *worſhip*, what he hath *forbidden* in his ſervice, becomes *unlawful*; and, ſo long as that command continues in force, all acts of *worſhip* contrary to it, are a *poſitive* kind of Idolatry. For, as there is a kind of *Natural Idolatry* lying in the *worſhip* of *falſe Gods* inſtead of the *true*; ſo there is that which may be called *Poſitive Idolatry*, which is a worſhipping *God* in a way or manner which he hath *forbidden*. From whence the *Iſraelites* in the *Golden Calf*, and the *Ten Tribes* in the *worſhip* of the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel*, are charged with *Idolatry*, although they acknowledged the true *God*, and deſigned that for a *Relative worſhip* to him. If it were ſo then, you ſhould have ſhewed us, How it comes to be otherwiſe now? Where it was, *God* revealed the ſecond *Commandment*? or, What there was in it typical and ceremonial, that it muſt ceaſe to oblige at *Chriſt's coming?* or, What *Reaſons* it was built on, which

P. 277.

P. 294.

were only proper to the *Jews*, and cannot extend to the *Chriſtians* too? and, Why *Relative Worſhip*, and the helps for *memory* and *devotion* would not as well have juſtified the uſe and worſhip of *Images*, before *Chriſt* as after? And why the ſame reaſons from the danger of *Idolatry*, low conceptions of *God* (and what other reaſons you will give of that prohibition then) may not hold as well ſtill? Theſe, and many other things, if you would have vindicated the practice of your *Church*, you ought to have inſiſted on. But ſince you omit them wholly, and think to put us off with repeating the decree of the *Council* of *Trent*, you only ſhew the weakneſs of your cauſe, and of thoſe unintelligible ſubtilties which are uſed to defend it.

§. 27. To what his Lordſhip ſaith, *That, in* Optatus *his time, the Chriſtians*
Optat. l. 3. *were much troubled upon but a falſe report, that an Image was to be placed upon the Altar; What would they have done, if Adoration had been commanded?* You anſwer, *That it was either ſome Idol, or common Image of a Man, or of the Emperour, or the Governour of the Province*, or ſomething or other, but you cannot tell what. But if it had been any of all theſe, how eaſie had it been for them to have vindicated themſelves by ſaying, That if it had been the *Image of Chriſt*, or ſome *Saint*, they would then have worſhipped it, but they could not otherwiſe? But we ſee, it was not becauſe it was ſuch or ſuch an *Image*, that the diſpleaſure was taken, but that it was *any* at all; and this was then juſtly looked on as a ſtrange thing, being ſo contrary to the practice of the *Chriſtian Church*, from *Chriſt*'s time till that. This you deny, and ſay, *That the Images of Chriſt and the Saints were in common uſe and veneration too, amongſt Chriſtians in the Ancient Church.* How is it poſſible to deal with you, that dare with ſo much confidence obtrude ſuch notorious falſities upon the world? There being ſcarce any thing imaginable, in which there are more expreſs teſtimonies for ſo many ages together than againſt the uſe or veneration of *Images* in the *Ancient Church*. With what ſcorn and contempt do the *Primitive Chriſtians* reject the uſe of *Images*, and that not in regard of an *abſolute*, but a *relative Worſhip?* If you had read the diſcourſes of the *Chriſtians* in the Primitive times, ſuch as *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, *Tertullian*, *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Athanaſius*, *Euſebius*, S. *Auguſtin* where they diſpute againſt the *Heathens*, not meerly for worſhipping *Idols*, but for any worſhip of *Images*, though meerly as they are *ſigns* or *ſymbols* of the proper *objects* of *worſhip*, you could not poſſibly have uttered ſo groſs a falſhood as that foregoing, unleſs you were reſolved to offer violence to your conſcience in it. If you think the *Council* of *Trent* brings off all this by ſaying, *Men muſt not believe there is any Divinity in Images*, and that it was the worſhip which aroſe from ſuch an apprehenſion which the Fathers diſputed againſt; I aſſure you, you are greatly deceived. For there is no ſuch difference between the *Heathens* apprehenſions, and yours, as to the worſhip of *Images*,
Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. as you imagine. *Who is ſuch a fool*, ſaith *Celſus*, *to think that theſe are gods,*
Arnob. l. 6. *and not the bare Images of them? You are greatly miſtaken* (ſaith the *Heathen* in *Arnobius*) *if you think that we worſhip the Images for gods; no, we worſhip the gods by and through them:* and therefore ſaith, *That the Ancients were not ignorant that the Images had neither ſenſe nor divinity in them, but only that the rude and ignorant people wanted ſuch things to put them in mind of the gods.* What is there more than this, that you have to plead for the uſe of
Lact. l. 2. c. 2. them? *Non ipſa timemus ſimulachra* (ſay the *Heathens* in *Lactantius*) *ſed eos ad quorum imaginem ficta, & quorum nominibus conſecrata ſunt; We worſhip not the Images, but them to whom they are conſecrated*; which in your language is, *They give them not an abſolute, but a relative Worſhip.* Nec ſi-
Aug. in Pſ. 113. c. 2. mulachrum nec Dæmonium colo, ſed per effigiem corporalem ejus rei ſignum

ſignum intueor, quam colere debeo, ſaith the *Heathen* in S. *Auguſtin*; *I neither worſhip the Image, nor the Dæmon in it, but only by that viſible repreſentation, I am put in mind of that which I ought to worſhip.* If you ſay, *This was not the common ſenſe of them, but only ſome more ſubtle men aſſerted this, becauſe they could not defend their groſs Idolatries otherwiſe*, the very ſame is moſt true of your ſelves; your diſtinctions are ſuch which the people are not capable of in the *worſhip* they give; and they only ſerve to anſwer thoſe, who diſlike ſo palpable an imitation of *Heatheniſm*, as is in the worſhip of *Images*. And it will be hard to find that any *Heathens* had any higher thoughts of their *Images*, or uſed greater acts of worſhip towards them, than the people of your *Church* do. For, Are not miraculous operations among you aſcribed to *Images* of *Saints*? And what greater teſtimony of *Divinity* can be ſuppoſed in them? Do not they fall down in the moſt devout manner to them, and make the moſt formal addreſſes before them? and that not meerly with a reſpect to what is repreſented, but with a worſhip belonging to the *Images* themſelves? And, What more than this did ever the *Heathens* do? So that thoſe *Fathers* who ſo much condemned that uſe and *veneration* of *Images* which was among the *Heathens*, muſt needs be underſtood to condemn as much that in your *Church* too. And thence *Euſebius* aſcribes the ſetting up the *Statue* at *Paneas* to a *Heathen cuſtom*; thence *Epiphanius rent the vail at* Anablatha, *wherein the Image of Chriſt, or ſome Saint, was drawn*; thence the *Council* of *Elvira* in *Spain, forbids the placing of pictures in Churches, leſt that which is worſhipped or adored, ſhould be painted on walls*; thence S. *Auguſtin condemns the worſhippers of pictures*; thence the *very Art of Painting was condemned in the Ancient Church*, as appears by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Tertullian*; and after all this, Is it poſſible to believe what you ſay, *viz. That Images were in common uſe and veneration too in the Ancient Church?* But ſurely we ſhall have ſome evident proof for ſo bold an aſſertion: It were well if there were any thing looked like it. For all that you produce, is only *that in* Tertullian's *time, the Chriſtians were abuſed with the nick-name of* Crucis Religioſi; *and that in* Chryſoſtom's *time, the Croſs made a glorious ſhew upon the Altar.* And, Are not theſe invincible proofs for the *veneration* of *Images* in the *Ancient Church?* But, Why do you not as well ſay, The *Chriſtians* worſhipped an *Aſſes Head*, the *Sun*, and *Ononychites*; for all theſe are in the ſame Chapter, and equally reckon'd among the falſe accuſations of the *Chriſtians*. But it ſeems you had rather believe the *Heathens* objection, than the *Chriſtians* denial, whoſe Anſwer we find expreſs to the contrary in *Minutius Felix, Cruces nec colimus, nec optamus, we neither wiſh for, nor worſhip Croſſes*; and *Tertullian*, in anſwer to the former cavil, ſaith, *Quod colimus nos, Deus unus eſt*; *That which we worſhip, is only God.* They were then ſtrangers to any ſuch *diſtinctions* of *worſhip* as you have invented to anſwer ſuch places with, *viz.* that they did not worſhip them *abſolutely*, but *relatively*. And for all that I can perceive, by the ſame diſtinctions you may prove that the *Chriſtians* did worſhip *Dæmons* and *Heroes*; for, although they deny it never ſo much, I may as well ſay, they meant only by it, that they did not worſhip them with the *Worſhip* proper only to *God*, but with an inferiour and *relative Worſhip*, as you ſay as much concerning Images; by which Art you may evade all *denyals* whatſoever. For your place of S. *Chryſoſtom*, the moſt that *Bellarmin* makes of it is, *That in his time the Croſs was wont to be painted in all places, in Cities, Houſes, Chambers, Veſſels*, not a word in him of *Altars*, which he would not have left out, had he found any ſuch thing in him, but you intended to take care we ſhould not ſearch too far, by not referring us to the *Edition* of S. *Chryſoſtom*, which you, or your Author made uſe of. But, What is all this to the *veneration*

Euſeb. hiſt. l. 7. c. 18. *Epiph. ep. ad Joh. Hieroſ.* *Concil. Eliber. can. 36.* *Aug. de morib. Eccleſ. Cath. c. 34.* *Clem. Alex. Protrept.* *Tertull. ad Hermog. init.*

P. 296.

Tertull. Apolog. c. 16.

Minut Fel. p. 33.

Bellarm. de Imag. Sanct. l. 2. c. 28.

neration of the *Croſs*, if we grant that it did make a glorious ſhew on the *Altar*? Could it not make a glorious ſhew, unleſs they all fell down and worſhipped it? And, Can you think now, that theſe teſtimonies are ſufficient againſt the whole ſtrain of Antiquity, to perſwade men that the *veneration* of *Images* was uſed in the *Ancient Church*? But you are men who can believe what you have a mind to; any word, clauſe, or impertinent allegation, that doth but ſeem afar off, to caſt an eye towards you, is preſently the *conſent of all Antiquity*, when the moſt pregnant teſtimonies of the beſt Writers of the *Church* againſt you, are piſh'd at, and ſcorned, or elſe eluded with moſt frivolous interpretations, or laſtly ſuſpected without any ſhadow of reaſon. As the Epiſtle of *Epiphanius*, and the *Canon* of the *Eliberine Council* have been in this preſent Controverſie. When you ſhall produce your other teſtimonies, an Anſwer ſhall attend them; but you muſt not think the ſtory of the *Statue* at *Paneas*, which *Euſebius* attributes to a *Heatheniſh Cuſtom* (beſides the many improbabilities in it) will ever perſwade us, that the *Chriſtians* did then worſhip *Images*. But it would now take up too much time to examine that particularly, with others of a like nature. What I have ſaid already, being ſufficient to give an account of the ſenſe of the Primitive *Church*, as to this ſubject, which is our preſent buſineſs.

§. 28. We paſs by the reſemblance between the *Feaſts* at the *Oratories* of *Martyrs*, and the *Heathen Parentalia*, *becauſe you ſay now it ſeems wholly extirpated.* And I would not charge you with more faults than you are guilty of, ſince you have enough without it. An evidence of which, is your diſcarding all perſons from your communion, who are not ſuch *Bigots*, as to approve
P. 298. all the abuſes and corruptions among you: Which ſufficiently appears by your cenſure of *Caſſander*; *Who* (you ſay) *ſeemed to many to halt between God and* Baal; *and, although he was not actually excommunicate, yet you would have us believe he was meritoriouſly ſo, becauſe he favoured Hereſie ſo much.* By which we ſee, that we muſt not judge all of the *Roman Communion*, who profeſs themſelves to be of it; for ſo *Caſſander* did to his death. But, whoever offer to find the leaſt fault with the practices or Doctrine of your *Church*, let them pretend never ſo much to be of it, yet they may be *excommunicate*, *ſententiâ juris*; and ſo not only *Caſſander*, but *Eraſmus*, *Eſpencæus*, *Ferus*, *Barns*, *Picherellus*, and all other perſons of reaſon and ingenuity among you, ought not to be looked on as *perſons* of your Communion, whatever their pretences be. It ſeems your *Church* bears none but *Hectors*, and in a ſhort time none ſhall be accounted *Papiſts*, but *Jeſuits*: but it is hard to determine, Whether this diſcovers more the *corruption*, or *tyranny* of your *Church*; which loves her degeneracy ſo much, that ſhe *proſcribes* all who dare in the leaſt to tell her of her *faults*. But, *How can ſhe be found fault with, that takes ſuch excellent care to prevent all abuſes, as*
P. 297. *appears by the caution of the Council of* Trent, *in the preſent caſe of your worſhip of Images?* For, ſay you, *As to any matter of abuſe in this kind, crept in amongſt the ignorant, we have already ſhewn, how careful the Council of* Trent *was to prevent and provide againſt all inconveniencies that could reaſonably be foreſeen or feared.* So it ſeems, by the admirable Caution uſed by the *Council* to prevent giving *undue Worſhip* to *Images*, by telling men, *They muſt only give that which was due*; when all the Queſtion was, What was *due*? and, What not? So it ſeems, by the care uſed to inſtruct the people concerning the nature of *Divine Worſhip*, and the danger of *Idolatry*. So it ſeems, by the leaving out the *ſecond Commandment* in the *offices* of frequent *uſe*, leſt the peoples conſciences ſhould check them, for doing that which *God* had ſeverely prohibited. So it ſeems, by the *unintelligible ſubtilties* concerning the kind of that *Worſhip* which is to be given to the *Image*;

when

when yet a miſtake there, makes the perſon who gives it, guilty of *Idolatry*. So it ſeems, by the continuance of the moſt groſs *abuſes* in this nature ſtill in your *Church*, in this matter of *Images*. Of which ſuch things are related by eye-witneſſes, that the moſt groſs *Heathen Idolatries* were not more unreaſonable, abſurd, and ridiculous, than they are. And if people continue ignorant, and ſottiſh enough, all is well; but if with *Caſſander*, they charge you with any *corruptions*, then they ſtand *meritoriouſly excommunicate*: and it is well if they eſcape ſo; for, although *Caſſander* did, *Father Barns* did not. But, plead as long as you will for the care your *Church* hath taken to prevent all abuſes in the worſhip of *Images*; as long as the worſhip of *Images* continues, it is impoſſible to prevent the *abuſes* in it; ſince that is a great *abuſe* it ſelf, and gives occaſion to all others. For, the vindication of your Doctrine depends on ſuch *Metaphyſical Niceties*, which the minds of people are uncapable of; and, however they may ſerve you in diſputation, are impoſſible to be reconciled with the *practice* of your *Church*, and the apprehenſions of thoſe who yield the worſhip you allow to *Images*. And therefore it is no wonder at all what *Llamas* relates of the *Spaniſh people, that they were ſo beſotted on their old worm-eaten Images, that when they were to have new ones in their rooms, they begg'd with tears to have their old ones ſtill.* But, although *you grant theſe people guilty of indiſcretion, yet by no means of Idolatry, becauſe they did not call them their gods.* If you think none were *Idolaters*, but ſuch as did believe their *Images to be gods*; I doubt you may find the number of *Atheiſts* as great as that of *Idolaters* in the world. But if we may gueſs at peoples *apprehenſions* by their *actions*, theſe ſeemed as much to believe them to be *gods*, as any *Heathens* you can inſtance in. Your vindication of *Llamas* from ſaying, *That the Images of Chriſt, and the Saints, as they repreſent their exemplars, have Deity or Divinity in them*; as it is undertaken ſomewhat fearfully, *becauſe* (you ſay) *you hope to clear his meaning, whatever his words ſeem to import*; ſo at laſt it ſtands on the ſandy foundation of *relative and abſolute Worſhip*, which being taken away, that and your *Images* fall together. I conclude this ſubject with his Lordſhips wiſh; *That men of learning would not ſtrain their wits to ſpoil the truth, and rent the Peace of the Church of Chriſt, by ſuch dangerous, ſuch ſuperſtitious vanities. For better they are not, but they may be worſe:* And I fear are ſo.

P. 298.

P. 299.

P. 279.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the poſſibility of Salvation in the *Roman* Church.

Proteſtants Conceſſions ought not to be any ground to prefer the Communion of the Church of Rome. *How far thoſe Conceſſions extend. The uncharitableneſs of Romaniſts, if they yield not the ſame to us. The weakneſs of the Arguments to prove the* Roman *Church the ſafer way to ſalvation on Proteſtant Principles. The dangerous Doctrines of Romaniſts about the eaſineſs of ſalvation, by the Sacrament of Penance. The caſe parallel'd between the Donatiſts and Romaniſts, in denying ſalvation to all but themſelves; and the advantages equal from their adverſaries Conceſſions. The advantage of the Proteſtants, if that be the ſafeſt way which both parties are agreed in, manifeſted and vindicated in ſeveral particulars. The Principle it ſelf at large ſhewed to be a meer contingent Propoſition, and ſuch as may lead to Hereſie and Infidelity. The caſe of the Leaders in the* Roman *Church, and others, diſtinguiſhed. The Errours and Superſtitions of the* Roman *Church, make its communion very dangerous in order to Salvation.*

§. 1. THe main thing which now remains to be diſcuſſed, is, Whether the Communion of your *Church*, or ours, be rather to be choſen, in order to *ſalvation*. For *that* being the great end of our *Faith*, the tendency to the promotion of that, ought to be the Rule, by which we ſhould embrace or continue in the ſociety of any *Church*. And, ſince the regard men ought to have of their eternal welfare, doth oblige them to make choice of the beſt means in order to it, the bare remote *poſſibility* of *ſalvation* in any *Church*, ought to have no force or conſideration at all in the determining their choice in a matter of ſo great importance. As, ſuppoſing a *Pilot* at *Sea*, whoſe only deſire is to bring his ſhip ſafe into his deſired *Port*, ſhould be told, that there are two paſſages homewards; the one free and open, in which there is no danger; the other amidſt many *Rocks* and *Shelves*, in which yet there is a *poſſibility* of eſcaping: Would not he be accounted a very weak man, that ſhould chuſe this latter way, meerly becauſe it is poſſible he may eſcape; and neglect the other, in which there is no danger of miſcarrying? So it is here in our preſent caſe, the *Proteſtants* confeſs there is a *poſſibility* for ſome to eſcape in the Communion of the *Roman Church*; but it is as men may eſcape with their lives in a *ſhipwrack*; but they undertake to make it evident, there can be no danger, if they obſerve the principles of *Proteſtant Religion*; Would it not be madneſs in any then to neglect this, and make choice of the other, meerly becauſe *Proteſtants* agree with you, that there is a *poſſibility* of *ſalvation* for ſome in the *Roman Church*? Yet this is the great Argument you make uſe of, whereby to *Proſelyte* ſuch perſons, who want judgement enough to diſcern the weakneſs and *ſophiſtry* of it. That therefore we are now to enquire into, is, Whether your Communion, or ours, be more eligible upon principles of reaſon and prudence, in order to *Salvation*? And two things are inſiſted on in behalf of your *Church*; firſt, *That Proteſtants grant the poſſibility of ſalvation in your Church*, but you deny it in ours, and therefore yours is the ſafer way. Secondly, *That the Faith of Proteſtants doth not ſtand upon thoſe ſure grounds which your Faith doth.*

§. 2. As to the *firſt*, there are two things to be conſidered. 1. How *far we grant a poſſibility of ſalvation to thoſe in your Church.* 2. *What can be inferr'd from that Conceſſion in the choice of Religion.* The occaſion of entring upon

upon this debate was the *Lady's Query, Whether ſhe might be ſaved in the* Roman *Faith*; to which his Lordſhip anſwers in *General*, that *the ignorant that could not diſcern the errors of that Church, ſo they held the Foundation and conformed themſelves to a religious life, might be ſaved; and more particularly to the Lady, that it muſt needs go harder with her even in point of ſalvation, becauſe ſhe had been brought to underſtand very much for one of her condition, in theſe Controverted cauſes of Religion. And a perſon that comes to know much, had need carefully bethink himſelf, that he oppoſe not known truth againſt the Church that made him a Chriſtian; for ſalvation may be in the Church of* Rome, *and they not find it that make ſureſt of it.* P. 280. And after, he explains himſelf more fully, *That* [*might be ſaved*] grants *but a poſſibility, no ſure or ſafe way to ſalvation; the poſſibility, I think, ſaith he, cannot be denyed to the ignorants, eſpecially becauſe they hold the Foundation, and cannot ſurvey the Building. And the Foundation can deceive no man that reſts upon it. But a ſecure way they cannot go, that hold with ſuch corruptions when they know them. Now, whether it be wiſdom, in ſuch a point as ſalvation is, to forſake a Church in which the ground of ſalvation is firm, to follow a Church in which it is but poſſible one may be ſaved, but very probable he may do worſe, if he look not well to the Foundation; judge ye.* P. 285. So that ſtill his Lordſhip aſſerts the *Proteſtants* way to be the only *ſafe* way to *ſalvation*; and that in the *Church* of *Rome* there is only a *limited poſſibility* of it, which is ſuch, that he ſayes, A. C. *or his fellows can take little comfort in.* For as he after declares himſelf, *Many Proteſtants indeed confeſs, there is ſalvation poſſible to be attained in the* Roman *Church; but yet they ſay withal, that the errors of that Church are ſo many, (and ſome ſo great, as weaken the Foundation) that it is very hard to go that way to Heaven, eſpecially to them that have had the truth manifeſted*; P. 285. and a little after, *But we have not ſo learned Chriſt, as either to return evil for evil in this heady courſe, or to deny ſalvation to ſome ignorant ſilly ſouls, whoſe humble peaceable obedience makes them ſafe among any part of men that profeſs the Foundation Chriſt.* And in another place, *I do indeed for my part (leaving other men free to their own judgement) acknowledge a poſſibility of ſalvation in the* Roman *Church. But ſo, as that which I grant to Romaniſts, is not as they are Romaniſts, but as they are Chriſtians, that is, as they believe the Creed and hold the Foundation Chriſt himſelf, not as they aſſociate themſelves wittingly and knowingly to the groſs Superſtitions of the* Roman *Church. And I am willing to hope there are many among them, which keep within that Church, and yet wiſh the ſuperſtitions abroliſhed which they know, and which pray to God to forgive their errors in what they know not, and which hold the Foundation firm, and live accordingly, and which would have all things amended that are amiſs, were it in their power. And to ſuch I dare not deny a poſſibility of ſalvation, for that which is Chriſts in them, though they hazard themſelves extreamly by keeping ſo cloſe to that which is ſuperſtition, and in the caſe of Images comes too near Idolatry.* P. 299. The ſubſtance then of what his Lordſhip ſaith, is, that the *Proteſtant* way is a ſafe and ſecure way to *ſalvation*; that in the *Roman Church* there is *extream hazard* made of it, which all who love their *ſouls* ought to avoid; but yet for ſuch, who by reaſon of *ignorance* ſee not the *danger*, and by reaſon of honeſty keep cloſe to *Chriſt* the *Foundation*, and repent of all miſcarriages known or unknown, he dares not deny a *poſſibility* of *ſalvation* for them. But he is far from aſſerting it of thoſe, who either know the corruptions of that *Church* and yet continue in them, or ſuch who wilfully neglect the means whereby they may be convinced of them. So that you ſtrangely either miſtake or pervert his Lordſhips meaning when you would inferr from theſe paſſages, *That he aſſerts a poſſibility of being ſaved to thoſe who joyn with the* Roman *Church, though their ignorance be not invincible, and though all or the chief motives which the Proteſtants bring* P. 301.

againſt you be never ſo ſufficiently propoſed to them. For he ſtill ſpeaks either of ſuch, whoſe meer *ignorance* doth excuſe them where the *Fundamentals* are held, and a life led according to them, or elſe of ſuch who condemn your *ſuperſtitions* as far as they are diſcovered to them, and ſincerely deſire to find impartially the way that leads to Heaven; Of ſuch as theſe he dares not deny a *poſſibility* of *ſalvation.*

§. 3. And you are the moſt uncharitable perſons in the world, if you dare aſſert the contrary of *Proteſtants.* You expreſly grant *a poſſibility of ſalvation to thoſe who joyn with the Proteſtant Church, in caſe of invincible ignorance*; and dare you deny it where there is a preparation of mind to find out and embrace the moſt certain way to Heaven, where all endeavours are uſed to that end, and where there is a conſcientious obedience to the *Will* of *God*, ſo far as it is diſcovered? If you dare peremptorily deny a *poſſibility* of *ſalvation* to ſuch perſons, meerly becauſe not of the *Roman Church*, this prodigious uncharitableneſs would make us queſtion the *poſſibility* of your *ſalvation* more, while you perſiſt in it. For, What is there more contrary to the *deſign* and *ſpirit* of the *Goſpel* than this is? From whence muſt we gather the terms of *ſalvation*, but only from thence? But it ſeems by you, although men give never ſo hearty an aſſent to the Doctrine of the *Goſpel*, and live in the moſt univerſal obedience to it, and abound in the *fruits* of the *ſpirit* of *God*, of which *Charity* is none of the leaſt; yet if they be not in the Communion of your *Church*, there is no hopes of *ſalvation* for them. But, Who is it the mean while that hath the diſpoſal of this *ſalvation?* Is it in your *hands* or *Chriſts?* If it be in His, we dare rely on His promiſe, although you pretend to know His mind better than He did himſelf. For, notwithſtanding a ſincere endeavour to know and obey the will of *God*, be the great *Fundamental* in order to *ſalvation*, which is delivered us by the Doctrine of *Chriſt*; yet it ſeems by you, there may be this, where there may be not ſo much as *poſſibility* of *ſalvation.* By which aſſertion of yours, you are ſo far from working upon any, but very weak perſons, to bring them over to your *Church*, that nothing can more effectually prejudice it among all ſuch who dare believe *Chriſt* to be more *Infallible* than the *Church* of *Rome.* For what is this elſe, but to make Heaven and eternal ſalvation *ſtalk* to the *intereſt* of your *Church*, and to lay more weight upon being in your communion than upon the moſt indiſpenſable precepts of *Chriſtianity?* But when we conſider how many among you diſpute for the poſſibility of the *ſalvation* of *Heathens*, and yet deny it to thoſe who own all the *Fundamentals* of *Chriſtianity*; when we ſee how much you lay the weight of ſalvation upon being in your *Church*, and what wayes you have for thoſe who are in it to reconcile the *hopes* of *ſalvation* with the practice of *ſin*, What can we otherwiſe imagine, but it is the Intereſs of your *Church* that you more aim at, than the *ſalvation* of *mens ſouls?* For you have ſo many wayes to give *indulgence* in *ſin* to thoſe who deſire it, and yet ſuch ready wayes of pardon, and ſuch an eaſie task of *repentance*, and ſo little troubleſome means of obtaining *grace* by the *Sacraments*, *ex opere operato*, that it is hard conceiving what way a man ſhould ſooner take, who would live in his ſins and come to Heaven at laſt, than to be of your *Church.* And yet you who are ſo *ſoft* and *gentle*, ſo *kind* and *indulgent* to the *ſons* of your *Church*, are not more ready to ſend thoſe who are out of it to the *fire* in this world, than to *eternal flames* in another. But *we have not ſo learned Chriſt*, we dare not deal ſo inhumanely with them in this world, much leſs judge ſo uncharitably as to another, of thoſe who profeſs *to fear God and work righteouſneſs*, though they be not of the ſame opinion or communion with us. Yet, we tell men of the danger of *hazarding* their *ſalvation* by *erroneous doctrines*

doctrines and ſuperſtitious practices, and ſuppoſe that ſufficient to perſwade ſuch who ſincerely regard their future *happineſs* to avoid all ſuch things as tend ſo much to their eternal *ruine*. And ſuch who will continue in ſuch things, meerly becauſe there is a *poſſibility* ſome perſons may be ſaved in them by reaſon of *Ignorance* or *Repentance*, are no wiſer men than ſuch, who ſhould *ſplit* their *ſhip* upon a *rock*, becauſe ſome have eſcaped upon a *plank* notwithſtanding. So that conſidering on what terms we grant this *poſſibility* of *ſalvation*, this Conceſſion of ours can be no Argument at all to judge yours to be the *ſafer* way; and if upon the ſame terms you deny it to us, it ſhews how much more *unſafe* your way is, where there is ſo much of *Intereſt* and ſo little *Charity*.

But you attempt to prove againſt all *Proteſtants* whatſoever, that yours is the ſafer way to *ſalvation*: Your firſt Argument in ſhort is, *Becauſe we grant that you may be ſaved upon our own principles, but you deny that we may be ſaved upon yours.* And what is there more in this Argument (but a multitude of words to little purpoſe) than there is in that which his Lordſhip examines? For the main force of it lyes in this, That is the ſafeſt way which both parties are agreed in; and therefore although you would have your *Major propoſition* put out of all doubt, yet that wants more proof than I doubt you are able to give it. For although we grant, Men may be ſaved who have true *Faith*, *Repentance*, and a holy *Converſation without any ſuch Sacrament of Penance, which you make neceſſary for conveying the grace of Juſtification*; yet What ſecurity can thence come to a man in the choice of his *Religion*, ſince we withal ſay, That where there is a continuance in the corruptions and errors of your *Church*, it is hard to conceive there ſhould be that *Faith* and *Repentance* which we make neceſſary to *Salvation*. You go therefore on a very falſe *ſuppoſition*, when you take it for granted *that we acknowledge, that all thoſe whom you admit to your Sacrament of Penance have all things upon our own principles which are neceſſary to Salvation.* And ſo your *Minor* is as falſe as your *Major* uncertain, viz. *That many are ſaved in the Roman Church according to the principles which are granted on both ſides.* But you would ſeem to prove, *That all admitted by you at death to the Sacrament of Penance* (as you call it) *have all things neceſſary to Salvation upon Proteſtant principles, becauſe*, you ſay, *That Faith, Hope, true Repentance, and a purpoſe of Amendment are neceſſary to the due receiving the Sacrament of Penance, and theſe are all which Proteſtants make neceſſary to Salvation.* But ſuppoſing that, Is it neceſſary that all thoſe things muſt be in them, which make the neceſſary requiſites to this *Sacrament* of yours? Do none receive this *unworthily* as many do a far greater *Sacrament* than this, granting it to be any at all? It ſeems *Salvation* is very eaſie to be had in your *Church* then, for this *Sacrament* is ſuppoſed by you, to be given to men upon their *death-beds, when*, you ſay, *It cannot be ſuppoſed that men will omit any thing neceſſary for the attaining Salvation; and by vertue of this Sacrament they receive the grace of Juſtification, whereby of ſinners, they are made the Sons of God, and heirs of eternal life.* But I aſſure you, we who believe, Men muſt be ſaved only by the terms of the *Goſpel*, make no ſuch eaſie matter of it as you do; we profeſs the *neceſſity* of a *through-renovation* of *heart* and *life* to be indiſpenſable in order to *happineſs*, for *without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord*: and although we take not upon us to judge the final eſtate of men whoſe *hearts* we know not; yet the *Goſpel* gives us very little ground to think, that ſuch who defer the work of their *Salvation* to their *death-beds*, ſhall ever attain to it; The main deſign of *Chriſtian Religion* being, The turning mens ſouls from *ſin* to *God* in order to the ſerving him in this world, that they may be *happy* in another. For if *Salvation* depended on no more than you require, the greateſt part of the *Goſpel* might have

§. 4. P. 301.

P. 302.

been ſpared, whoſe great end is to perſwade men to *holineſs of heart and life*. It is not a meer *purpoſe* of *amendment*, when men can ſin no longer, that we make only neceſſary to *Salvation*: But ſo hearty a *repentance* of *ſin* paſt, as to carry with it an *effectual* reformation; without this, men may flatter themſelves into their own *ruine* by your *Sacraments of Penance* and ſuch contrivances of men, but there can be no grounded hopes of any freedom from eternal miſery. And their *Faith* too, muſt be as *weak* as their *Repentance ſhallow*, who dare *venture* their *ſouls* into another world, upon no better *ſecurity* than that *By receiving the Sacrament of Penance they are made the Sons of God, and heirs of eternal life*. But you betray men into ſtupid ignorance and careleſneſs as to their eternal Salvation, and then deal moſt unfaithfully with them, by telling them, that a *death-bed Repentance* will ſuffice them, and the *Sacrament of Penance will preſently make them heirs of eternal life*. So that although your *Doctrine* be very unreaſonable, and your *Superſtitions* very *groſs*, yet this unfaithfulneſs to the ſouls of men makes all true lovers of *Chriſtian Religion*, and of the *Salvation* of mens ſouls, more averſe from your *Doctrine* and *Practices*, than any thing elſe whatſoever. For what can really be more pernicious to the world, than to flatter them into the hopes of *Salvation* without the performance of thoſe things, which, if the *Goſpel* be true, are abſolutely neceſſary in order to it? How quietly do you permit the moſt ſtupid *ignorance* in ſuch who are the *zealous practiſers* of your *fopperies* and *ſuperſtitions*? What excellent arts have you to allure *debauchees* upon their *death-beds* to you, by promiſing them that in another world, which our principles will not allow us to do? How many wayes have you to get the *pardon of ſin*, or at leaſt to delude people with the hopes of it, without any ſerious turning from *ſin* to *God*? What do your *Doctrines* of the ſufficiency of *bare contrition*, and the *Sacraments working grace ex opere operato*, of *Indulgences*, *Satisfactions*, *regulating the intention*, and the like, tend to, but to ſuperſede the neceſſity of a holy life? And at laſt you exchange the inward hatred and mortification of ſin, for ſome external *ſeverities* upon mens *bodies*; which is, only beating the *ſervant* for the *Maſters fault*. So that it is hard to imagine any Doctrine or way of *Religion* which owns *Chriſtianity*, which doth with more apparent danger to the ſouls of men undermine the foundations of Faith and Obedience than yours doth. And as I have at large ſhewed the former, How deſtructive your principles are to the *grounds* of *Faith*; ſo it hath been fully and lately manifeſted by a learned *Biſhop* of our *Church*, What Doctrines and practices are allowed in your *Church*, which in themſelves or their immediate conſequences are *direct impieties*, and *give warranty to a wicked life*.

Biſhop *Taylors* Diſſuaſive from Popery, *chap.* 2. §. 5.

Which being ſo of your own ſide, we muſt ſee what reaſons you give for your moſt uncharitable Cenſure, *That there are very few or none among Proteſtants that eſcape damnation*: And this you call, *The Doctrine of Catholicks*. The Doctrine rather of a proud, tyrannical, and uncharitable faction of men; who that they might gain *Proſelytes* to themſelves, ſhew how little they are themſelves the *Proſelytes* of *Chriſt*. But you offer us a reaſon for it: *Becauſe all Catholicks hold, that neither Faith, nor Hope, nor any Repentance can ſave us, but that only which is joyned with a perfect Love of God; without the Sacrament of Penance actually and duely received: and becauſe Proteſtants reject this, they cannot be ſaved*. But you are not at all the leſs excuſable, becauſe you aſſert ſuch *Doctrines* from whence ſuch *uncharitableneſs* follows, but the dreadful conſequence of ſuch Doctrines ought rather to make you queſtion the *truth* of them. For, can any one who knows and underſtands *Chriſtianity* ever believe, that although he had a moſt hearty repentance for ſin, and a moſt ſincere *love* to *God*, he ſhould eternally periſh, becauſe he did not confeſs his ſins to a *Prieſt* and receive

P. 302.

P. 303.

receive *abſolution* from him? I can hardly perſwade my ſelf, that you can believe ſuch things, but that only ſuch *Doctrines* are neceſſary to be taught, to maintain the *Prieſts authority*, and to fright men into that *picklock* of conſcience, the uſeful practice of *Auricular Confeſſion*. To what purpoſe are all the promiſes of *grace and mercy through Chriſt* upon the ſincerity of our turning to him, if after all this, the effect depends upon that *Sacrament of Penance*, of which no precept is given us by *Chriſt*, much leſs any neceſſity of it aſſerted in order to eternal Salvation? If this then be all your ground of condemning *Proteſtants*, they may rejoyce in this, That your reaſons are as weak as your malice ſtrong. But it would be more fit for you to enquire, whether ſuch who live and die in ſuch a height of uncharitableneſs (whether with or without the *Sacrament* of *Penance*) can be in any capacity of eternal *Salvation?* For that is a plain violation of the *Laws* of *Chriſt*, this other even among your ſelves a diſputable *Inſtitution* of Chriſt; and by many ſaid, not to be at all of that *neceſſity*, which you ſuppoſe it to be. For neither *Medina*, nor *Maldonate* even ſince the *Council* of *Trent* dare affirm, the denyal of your *Sacrament* of *Penance* to be *Hereſie*; and muſt then the ſouls of all *Proteſtants* be ſent to Hell, for want of that, which it is queſtionable, whether it were *Inſtituted* by *Chriſt* or no. But if this *Sacrament of Penance* be ſo neceſſary to Salvation, that they cannot be ſaved who want it, What becomes then of all the *Primitive Church* which was utterly a ſtranger to your *Sacrament of Penance* (as ſhall be manifeſted when you deſire it)? what becomes of the *Greek Church* which as peremptorily denies the neceſſity of it as *Proteſtants* do? Both which you may find confeſſed and proved by *Father Barns*, and many teſtimonies of your own Authors are brought by him againſt the *Divine Inſtitution* and *neceſſity* of it. Who very ingenuouſly confeſſes, *That, by the Law of Chriſt, ſuch a one by the ſentence of very many Catholicks, may be pronounced abſolved before God, who manifeſts the truth of his Faith and Charity, although he diſcovers not a word of the number or weight of his ſins.* What unreaſonable, as well as uncharitable, men are you then, to aſſert, *That no Proteſtants can eſcape damnation for want of that*, which ſo many among your ſelves make unneceſſary for the pardon of ſin? But it is juſt with *God*, that thoſe who are ſo ready to condemn others, ſhould be condemned by themſelves: and if your Conſciences do not condemn you here, your Sentence may be the greater in another world.

Medina de Confeſſ. tr. 2. qu 4. Maldon. de Sacram. T. 2. c. 3.

Cum ſtando in lege Chriſti præciſe pronunciari poſſit, ex plurimorum Catholicorum ſententiâ, abſolutus coram Deo;—— qui manifeſtis indiciis probat ſe veram habere fidem & charitatem; etſi nè verbum propalet de numero, & gravitate peccatorum ſuorum. Barns ſect. 8. de pœnit. confeſſ. & ſatisfactione.

Your ſecond Argument againſt *Proteſtants* is, *Becauſe they want certainty of Faith by denying the Infallibility of Church and Councils*; but this hath been ſo throughly ſifted already, that I ſuppoſe none who have read the preceding diſcourſes, will have the leaſt cauſe to ſtick at this: and therefore we proceed to the Vindication of your cenſures from being guilty of the *want* of *Charity*. For you are the men, who would have us *thank God, when you condemn us to Hell*, that we eſcape ſo; and are *angry* with us, that we do not believe that you moſt *entirely love us*, when you *judge us to eternal flames*. *For*, you ſay, *that your denyal of Salvation to us is grounded even upon Charity*. If it be ſo, you are the moſt *charitable* people in the world, for you deny *Salvation* to all but your *ſelves* and ſome *Heathens*. *But*, ſay you, *If Salvation may be had in your Church as Proteſtants confeſs, and there be no true Church or Faith but one, it follows that out of your Church there is no Salvation to be had.* To which his Lordſhip had fully anſwered, by ſaying, *'Tis true, there is but one true Faith, and but one true Church; but that one both Faith and Church is the Catholick Chriſtian, not the particular Roman.* So that this paſſage is a meer begging the queſtion, and then threatning upon it, without all reaſon or charity. And all

§. 6 P. 304.

P. 305.

P. 284.

P. 306. all your declamations about *the way of knowing the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*, have been ſpoiled by what hath been ſaid already upon that ſubject. We come therefore to that which is the proper buſineſs of this *Chapter*, which is to examine the ſtrength of that *Inference* which is drawn from the *Proteſtants* conceſſion of the *poſſibility* of *Salvation* in your *Church*, viz. *That thence it follows, that the Roman Church and Religion is the ſafer way to Salvation.* Two things his Lordſhip obſerves the force of this Argu-
P. 285. ment lyes in, *the one directly expreſſed*, viz. *The conſent of both parties of the poſſibility of Salvation in the Roman Church*; the other *upon the By*, viz. *That we cannot be ſaved, becauſe we are out of the Church.* And of theſe two he ſpeaks in order. Firſt he begins with the *confeſſion*: as to which his Anſwer lyes in three things, 1. *That this was the way of the Donatiſts of old, and would hold as well for them as the Church of* Rome. 2. *That if the principle on which this Argument proceeds be true, it will be more for the advantage of Proteſtants than of your Church.* 3. *That the principle it ſelf is a contingent Propoſition, and may juſtifie the greateſt Hereſies in the world.* By this methodizing his Lordſhips diſcourſe, we ſhall the better diſcern the ſtrength of your Anſwers to the ſeveral particulars of it. In the firſt place he ſhews, *How parallel this is with the proceedings of the Donatiſts; for both parts*
P. 286. *granted, that Baptiſm was true among the Donatiſts, but the Donatiſts denyed it to be true baptiſm among the Catholick Chriſtians, and therefore on this principle the Donatiſts ſide is the ſurer ſide, if that principle be true, That it is the ſafeſt*
P. 307. *taking that way which the differing parties agree on.* To this you anſwer nothing, but what will ſtill return upon your ſelves, and diſcover the weakneſs of your Argument. For the crimes of *Schiſm*, *and unſoundneſs of Faith*, are ſtill as chargeable upon you, though we may grant a poſſibility of Salvation to ſome in your *Church*. And I cannot poſſibly diſcern any difference between the judgement of the *Catholicks* concerning the *Donatiſts*, and ours concerning you; for, if they judged the *Donatiſts* way very dangerous becauſe of their *uncharitableneſs* to all others, ſo do we of yours; but if they, notwithſtanding that, hoped that the miſled people among them might be ſaved; that is as much as we dare ſay concerning you. And you very much miſtake, if you think the contrary. For his Lordſhip no where ſaith, as you would ſeem to impoſe upon him, *That a man may live and dye in the* Roman *Church, and that none of his errors ſhall hinder ſalvation, whatſoever*
P. 296. *motives he may know to the contrary.* But on the other ſide, he plainly ſaith, *That he that lives in the* Roman *Church, with a reſolution to live and dye in it, is preſumed to believe as that Church believes. And he that doth ſo, I will not ſay, is as guilty, but guilty he is more or leſs, of the Schiſm which that Church firſt cauſed by her corruptions, and now continues by them and her power together. And of all her damnable opinions too, and all other ſins alſo, which the Doctrine and miſ-belief of that Church leads him into.* Judge you now, I pray, Whether we think otherwiſe of thoſe in your *Church*, than the *Orthodox* did of the *Donatiſts*? So that if the Argument doth hold for you, it would as well have held for them too. And therefore his Lordſhip well infers, *That this Principle, That where two parties are diſſenting, it is ſafeſt believing that in which both parties agree, or which the adverſary confeſſes, may lead men, by your own confeſſion, into known and damnable Schiſm and Hereſie; for ſuch, you ſay, the*
P. 298. *Donatiſts were guilty of.* And ſuch, his Lordſhip ſaith, *there is great danger of, in your Church too; for*, ſaith he, *in this preſent caſe there's peril, great peril of damnable, both Schiſm and Hereſie, and other ſins, by living and dying in the* Roman *Faith, tainted with ſo many ſuperſtitions, as at this day it is, and their tyranny too boot.* I pray now bethink your ſelf, What difference is there, between the Orthodoxes judgement of the *Donatiſts*, and ours, concerning your *Church*? And therefore the compariſon between *Petilian*

the

the *Donatiſt*, and his Lordſhips *adverſary* holds good ſtill; for, all your Anſwer depends upon a miſtake of *Proteſtants* granting a *poſſibility of Salvation*, as I have already ſhewed you. And, in what way ſoever you limit this agreement, you cannot poſſibly avoid, but that it would equally hold as to the *Donatiſts* too; for the conceſſion was then as great, in order to Salvation, as it is now. P. 315.

§. 7. But you ſay, *Whether he aſſerts it or no, it muſt needs follow from the Biſhops Principles, that there can be no peril of damnation by living and dying in the* Roman *Church, becauſe he profeſſedly exempts the Ignorant, and grants as much of thoſe who do wittingly and knowingly aſſociate themſelves to the groſs ſuperſtitions of the* Roman *Church, if they hold the Foundation Chriſt, and live accordingly*; From whence you argue, *That if neither voluntary nor involuntary ſuperſtition can hinder from Salvation, then there is confeſſedly no peril of damnation in your Church.* And yet his Lordſhip ſaith, *All Proteſtants unanimouſly agree in This, That there is great peril of damnation for any man to live and dye in the* Roman *Perſwaſion. And therefore* (ſaith he) *that is a moſt notorious ſlander, where you ſay, that they which affirm this peril of damnation, are contradicted by their own more learned Brethren.* By which we ſee the injuſtice of your proceeding, in offering to wreſt his Lordſhips words contrary to his expreſs meaning: and ſince all your Argument depends upon your adverſaries confeſſion, you ought to take that confeſſion in the moſt clear and perſpicuous terms, and to underſtand all obſcure expreſſions ſuitably to their often declared ſenſe. Which if you had attended to, you would never have undertaken to prove that his Lordſhip grants, that there is no peril of damnation in your Church, which he ſo often diſavows, and calls it, *a moſt notorious ſlander*; and, *a moſt loud untruth, which no ingenuous man would ever have ſaid.* And even of thoſe perſons whom he ſpeaks moſt favourably of, he ſaith, *That although they wiſh for the aboliſhing the ſuperſtitions in uſe, yet all he grants them is, a poſſibility of Salvation, but with extream hazard to themſelves, by keeping cloſe to that which is ſuperſtition, and comes ſo near Idolatry.* Are theſe then ſuch expreſſions which import *no peril of damnation* in the *Roman Church*? And therefore when he ſpeaks of the *poſſibility* of the *Salvation* of ſuch *who aſſociate themſelves wittingly and knowingly to the groſs ſuperſtitions of the Romiſh Church*; he declares ſufficiently, that he means it not of thoſe who do in heart approve of them, but only of ſuch, who though they are convinced they are groſs *ſuperſtitions*, yet think, they may communicate with thoſe who uſe them, as long as they do not approve of them. Which error of theirs, though he looks on it as dangerous, yet not as wholly deſtructive of Salvation. But ſince, your Anſwer to this is, *That he miſtakes very much, in ſuppoſing ſuch perſons to belong to your Church and Communion*: you are not aware, How much thereby you take off from the Proteſtants Confeſſion, ſince thoſe whom we contend for a poſſibility of *Salvation* for, are ſuch only whom you *deny* to be of your *Churches Communion*, and ſo the Argument ſignifies much leſs by your *confeſſion*, than it did before. Thus we ſee, how this Argument upon the ſame terms you manage it againſt us, would have held as well in the behalf of the *Donatiſts* againſt the Communion of the *Catholick Church*. For what other impertinencies you mix here and there, it is time now to paſs them over, ſince the main grounds of them have been ſo fully handled before. P. 301. P. 316.

§. 8. We therefore proceed to the *ſecond Anſwer* his *Lordſhip* gives to this Argument, *viz. That if the Principle on which it ſtands, doth hold, it makes more for the advantage of Proteſtants, than againſt them.* For if that be ſafeſt which both parties are agreed in, then 1. *You are bound to believe with us in the point of the Euchariſt. For all ſides agree in the Faith of the Church of* England, *that in the moſt bleſſed Sacrament, the worthy Receiver is by his Faith* P. 285.

Faith made ſpiritually partaker of the true and real body and blood of Chriſt, truly and really, and of all the benefits of his paſſion. Your Roman *Catholicks add a manner of this preſence, Tranſubſtantiation, which many deny; and the Lutherans Conſubſtantiation, which more deny. If this Argument be good then, even for this conſent it is ſafer communicating with the Church of* England, *than with the* Roman *or* Lutheran; *becauſe all agree in this Truth, not*
P. 308. *in any other Opinion.* You ſay, *This can hold no further than communicating in the belief of this Opinion*; let that be granted, and, Doth it not then follow, that the *Church* of *England*'s Opinion is *the ſafeſt* upon your own ground? *No*, ſay you, *for it is not ſuch a common conſent as doth exclude the manner of preſence, by tranſ-, or conſubſtantiation.* But, How ſenſleſs an Anſwer is this! for the Argument proceeds ſo *far* as all are agreed: and the *Church* of *England* aſſerting that *real preſence*, which all acknowledge as ſimply *neceſſary* in order to the effects of it; her Communion is more deſirable on this account, than of either of thoſe *Churches* which offer to define the manner of *Chriſt*'s preſence, ſince even the greateſt men of your perſwaſion, as *Suarez*
P. 308. and *Bellarmin*, aſſert the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation not to be ſimply neceſſary to Salvation*, and *that the manner of it is ſecret and ineffable.* It is therefore quite beſide the purpoſe, when you offer to prove, *that* Suarez *believed Tranſubſtantiation*: for, although he did ſo, yet ſince he grants it *not ſimply neceſſary to do it*; his Lordſhips Argument in behalf of the *Church* of *England* holds firm ſtill, unleſs you can prove, that *Suarez* held the belief of that to be as *neceſſary*, as the belief of the *real* and *ſpiritual preſence* of *Chriſt*. But you, after, attempt at large to prove, *that the real participation of Chriſt in the Sacrament in your ſenſe, is quite different from that of Proteſtants*: If you mean a *corporal participation*, indeed it is ſo; but that is not it, which is now enquired after; but, Whether you do not allow any *real* and *ſpiritual preſence* of *Chriſt*, beſides the *corporal manducation* of that you call his *body by Tranſubſtantiation*. If you do not, you would do well to ſhew, what *effects* that hath upon the *ſouls* of men; if you do, then ſtill the *Church* of *England* is of the *ſafer* ſide, which holds that in which all are agreed. Which is as much as we are here concerned to take notice of, as to this ſubject, the Controverſie it ſelf having
P. 303. been ſo lately handled. 2. His Lordſhip inſtances, *in the Article of our Saviour Chriſt's deſcent into Hell*; *both are agreed as to the Article of deſcent, but the Church of* Rome *differs in the explication*; *therefore it is ſafer holding with the Church of* England, *which owns the Article without defining the manner.*
P. 317. But, you ſay, *He proceeds on a falſe ſuppoſition, for both are not agreed, what is meant by Hell, whether it be the place of the damned or no:* But this doth belong to the manner of *Explication*, and not to the *Article* it ſelf, which both equally own, and therefore the *Church* of *England* hath the advantage there. 3. He inſtances in the *Inſtitution of the Sacrament in both kinds*; *in which it is agreed by both Churches, that Chriſt did inſtitute it ſo, and the Primitive Church received it ſo. Therefore according to the former*
Ibid. *Rule, 'tis ſafeſt for a man to receive the Sacrament in both kinds.* This (you ſay) *is as little to the purpoſe as the former, becauſe you do not agree that he did it with an intention, or gave any command that it ſhould be always ſo received*; but ſtill you are quite beſides the buſineſs; for that is not our Queſtion, but, Whether it be more *ſafe* to adhere to that which *Chriſt inſtituted*, and the *Primitive Church practiſed*, as you confeſs your ſelves; Or to your *Church*, which prohibits the doing that which you confeſs *Chriſt*, and the
P. 318. *Primitive Church* did? And we ſee how great your *Charity* is, when you *deny a poſſibility of Salvation to thoſe who aſſert that Chriſts Inſtitution is unalterable, or that all who communicate, are bound to receive in both kinds.* For all other things concerning this ſubject, I muſt refer the Reader to the
P. 305. precedent Chapter, in which they are fully diſcuſſed. 4. *The diſſenting*

Churches

Churches agree, that in the Euchariſt there is a ſacrifice of duty, and a ſacrifice of praiſe, and a ſacrifice of commemoration. Therefore it is ſafeſt to hold to the Church of England *in this, and leave the Church of* Rome *to her ſuperſtitions that I ſay no more.* Here you ſtill pretend, *you differ in ſenſe*; but all this is only to ſay, you aſſert more than we do; which we grant, but aſſert upon your Principle, that we are on the ſafer ſide. And ſo in the *intention of the Prieſt you agree with us as to the neceſſity of matter and form, and therefore it is ſafer holding to that, than believing the neceſſity of the Prieſts intention, which many deny.* And if the Rule doth hold, as you aſſert, That that which both are agreed in, is ſafer than the contrary; it will hold in matter of Opinion too, that it is ſafer to believe no more is neceſſary to the *Sacrament*, than both parties are agreed in. The laſt inſtance is, *That we ſay, there are divers errours, and ſome groſs ones, in the* Roman *Miſſal; but you confeſs there is no poſitive errour in the Liturgy of the Church of* England; *and therefore it is ſafeſt to worſhip God by that, and not by the* Roman *Maſs.* This you anſwer as all the reſt, by running off from the buſineſs; for, you ſay, *It cannot be ſafer to uſe that, becauſe you Catholicks ſay, That to uſe it in contempt of the* Roman *Miſſal is certainly damnable ſin, and deſtructive of Salvation.* But, as it is not material what you ſay in this caſe, ſo it is not at all to the purpoſe; for, if your Rule holds good, it muſt be *ſafer*; and, if it be not, you muſt confeſs the Principle is falſe, *That what both parties agree in, is the ſafeſt to be choſen in Religion.* The ſame might be at large proved concerning the main things in difference between us, that, if this Principle be true, we have very much the advantage of you: as, You and we are agreed, that the *Scripture* is *God's Word*, but we deny that *Tradition* is ſo, therefore it is ſafer adhering to the *Scripture*, and let *Tradition* ſhift for it ſelf. You and we are agreed that there are ſufficient *Motives* of *Credibility*, to believe the *Scripture*; but we deny that there are any ſuch *Motives* to believe the preſent *Churches Infallibility*; therefore it is ſafer to believe the *Scripture*, than the preſent *Church*. So that this Principle, if improved by theſe, and other *Inſtances*, will redound more to our advantage, than yours, conſidering that in the caſe we grant it as to you, it is joyned with a *Proteſtation* of the *extreme hazard* which thoſe run, who venture on your Communion, on the account of it; but there is no ſuch danger upon the agreement with us in thoſe Principles which are agreed upon between us.

P. 319. P. 307. P. 320.

3. His Lordſhip anſwers truly, *that this Propoſition, That in point of Faith and Salvation, 'tis ſafeſt for a man to take that way which the adverſary confeſſes, or differing parties agree in, is no Metaphyſical Principle, but a bare contingent Propoſition, and may be true or falſe as the matter is to which it is applyed, and ſo of no neceſſary truth in it ſelf, nor able to lead in the Concluſion. Becauſe conſent of diſagreeing parties, is neither Rule, nor Proof of Truth. For* Herod *and* Pilate, *diſagreeing parties enough, yet agreed againſt Truth it ſelf. But Truth rather is, or ſhould be, the Rule to frame, if not to force agreement.* And to prove this further, his Lordſhip ſhews, *That if this Principle hold good, that 'tis ſafeſt to believe as the diſſenting parties agree, or as the adverſe party confeſſes, a man muſt be an Heretick in the higheſt degree, if not an Infidel.* For, 1. *In the Queſtion between the Orthodox and Arrian concerning the Conſubſtantiality of the Son of God with the Father; The Orthodox confeſſed that which the Arrians aſſerted*, viz. *that Chriſt was of a like nature with his Father; but they added more*, viz. *that he was of the ſame nature. Therefore upon this Principle it would be ſafeſt holding with the Arrians.* 2. In the Queſtion *about the Reſurrection; the diſſenting parties agree, that there ought to be a Reſurrection from ſin, to the ſtate of grace, and that this Reſurrection only is meant in divers paſſages of Scripture, together with the life of the ſoul, which they are content to ſay is Immortal; but they deny any Reſurrection of the body after death. And therefore if this Principle be true, it will be ſafeſt*

§. 9. P. 288. P. 308.

to deny the Article of the Resurrection. 3. In the great dispute about *the Unity of the Godhead; all dissenting parties, Jew, Turk, and Christian, and all sects of Christians, agree in this, that there is but one God; and so by virtue of this Principle, men will be bound to deny the Trinity.* 4. In the Article of *the Divinity of Christ, The dissenting parties agree fully and clearly, that Christ is man; but the Hereticks deny him to be God: if it be therefore safest to go by the consent of dissenting parties, or the confession of adversaries, it will be safest believing that Christ is a meer man, and not God.* From whence his Lordship
P. 311. most evidently proves, *That this Rule, To resolve a mans Faith into that, in which the dissenting parties agree, or which the adverse party confesses, is a meer contingent Proposition, and is as often false as true. And false in as great, if not greater matters than those, in which it is true. And where it is true, you dare not govern your selves by it; the Church of* Rome *condemning those things which that Rule proves.* And his Lordship justly admires, *that while you talk of Certainty, nay, of Infallibility, you are driven to make use of such poor shifts as these, which have no Certainty at all of Truth in them, but inferr Falshood and Truth alike. And yet for this also, men will be so weak, or so wilful, as to be seduced by you.* But now it is time to take notice, what Answer you return to these pregnant *Instances* which his Lordship uses; and you think to take off all
P. 321. this by one General Answer, *viz. That the Rule speaks this precisely, and no more,* viz. *that when two parties differ in point of Religion, 'tis in prudence safest to take that way wherein both parties grant Salvation to be obtainable; but in the former Instances, Salvation was not allowed by the Orthodox to the dissenters.* But, how poor an Evasion this is, will be very easily discovered. For, 1. If that Principle be true, it must be built on that which his Lordship disproves, *viz. That when two parties disagree, it is safest believing that which both consent in.* For, let any reasonable man judge, on what account I ought to make choice of your *Religion*; you say, *Because both parties are agreed that men may be saved in your Church*; well then, I ask, Why I ought to believe that which both parties are agreed in? Doth it not necessarily resolve it self into this Principle, *That it is safest believing that which both parties consent in?* For if this be not safest, Why should I be more inclined by their consent, than otherwise? So that if you let go this, you let go the only foundation on which that Principle stands. For if the consenting *parties* may agree in a *falshood*, What evidence can I have, but that this is one of those *falshoods* they may agree in? And therefore it is far from being the safest way to venture upon that which the dissenting parties agree in. And because *Salvation* is a matter of the highest moment, if the Principle will not hold as to matter of particular Opinion, much less certainly in the most weighty affair of mens eternal *Salvation.* And it ought to be a safe Principle indeed, which men should venture their souls upon, and not so uncertain *Topical* an Argument as this is. So that it is so far from being a matter of *prudence* to make choice of Religion on such a Principle, that no man can be guilty of greater weakness or imprudence, than by doing so. 2. If this Principle should be limited only to a *possibility of Salvation*, yet, as to that, it is easie to discover, how false and uncertain a principle it is, because it is generally the nature of *Sects*, to be *uncharitable*, and to deny *Salvation* to all but themselves: Whereas the Orthodox *Christians* in all ages have hoped the best of those who were misled among them; and on this ground it would still be safer to be on the *Sectaries*, than the *Churches* side. You have therefore gained an excellent Principle for the advantage of your *Church*; which, if it hold for you, will hold as well for the most *uncharitable Sectaries* that are in the world. Nay, we may go somewhat further; and, What think you if *Heathenism* it self will be proved the safest way to Salvation? For many of you agree with them, *That many of them might be saved, without any explicite knowledge of Christ*; but they deny, *you can be saved*

ſaved by it: if then this Principle be found, farewel the *Church* of *Rome*, and welcome *Philoſophy*. If you ſay, *They are only ſome among you who aſſert the poſſibility of the Salvation of Heathens*; you know, the very ſame Anſwer will hold as to us; for, you confeſs, *That many Proteſtants grant no more to you, than you do to them, in order to Salvation.* P. 301. If you ſay, *That Heathens may be ſaved only on ſuppoſition of a general Repentance*; that is all that any of us ſay as to you. So that if the Argument will hold one way, it muſt the other too; and it argues, you are very much to ſeek for proofs, when you make uſe of this to perſwade men to be of your *Church*. And you have no cauſe to triumph in the Converſion of ſuch, who ſuffer themſelves to be impoſed on by ſo palpable a piece of *Sophiſtry* as this is. But your way is to deal with the weakeſt, and ſuch as are capable of ſuch eaſie *impreſſions* as theſe are.

His Lordſhip, from that which was expreſſed, comes to that which was implyed in this Argument, *viz. That we cannot be ſaved, becauſe we are out of the Church.* As to which, he ſaith, *We are not out of the Catholick Church, becauſe not within the* Roman. P. 313. *For the* Roman *Church, and the Church of* England, *are but two diſtinct members of that Catholick Church, which is ſpread over the face of the earth. If you can prove, that* Rome *is properly the Catholick Church it ſelf, ſpeak out, and prove it.* This you ſay, *you have done already*; but, how poorly, P. 321. let the Reader judge. But, when you add, *That in the day of account, the* Roman *Church will be found not an elder Siſter, but a Mother*; it will be well for her, if it prove not, only in the ſenſe wherein *Babylon* the *Great* is called ſo, *viz. the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the Earth.* Rev. 17. 5.

The Controverſie, you tell us, *goes on touching* Roman-*Catholicks Salvation*; §. 10. and we muſt follow it; though without breaking it into ſeveral *Chapters*, as P. 222. you do, that ſo we may lay together all that belongs to the ſame ſubject. And here his Lordſhip diſtinguiſhes *the caſe of ſuch, whoſe calling and ſufficiency gives them a greater capacity for underſtanding the Truth; and ſuch, whom, as S.* Auguſtin *ſpeaks, the ſimplicity of believing makes ſafe. So that there's no Queſtion,* ſaith he, *but many were ſaved in corrupted times of the Church, when their leaders, unleſs they repented before death, were loſt.* Which he underſtands, *of ſuch Leaders, as refuſe to hear the Churches inſtruction, or to uſe all the means they can to come to the knowledge of the Truth. For if they do this, err they may; but Hereticks they are not; as is moſt manifeſt in S.* Cyprian's *caſe of Re-baptization. But when Leaders add Schiſm to Hereſie, and Obſtinacy to both, they are loſt without Repentance, while many that ſucceed them in the errour only without obſtinacy may be ſaved. That is, in caſe they hold theſe errours not ſupinely, not pertinaciouſly, not uncharitably, not factiouſly,* i. e. *in caſe all endeavours be uſed after Truth and Peace, and all expreſſions of Charity ſhewed to all who retain an internal Communion with the whole viſible Church of Chriſt in the fundamental points of Faith. Such as theſe he confeſſes to be in a ſtate of Salvation, though their miſ-leaders periſh.* This is the ſumm of his Lordſhips diſcourſe. Which you call, *a heavy doom againſt all the* Roman *Doctors in general* (for what P. 323. you ſay before is a meer declamation and repetition of what hath been often examined.) But you ask, *How could they be all loſt, who by the Biſhops own Principles, were members of the true viſible Church of Chriſt, by reaſon of their being baptized, and holding the Foundation?* But, Doth his Lordſhip ſay, that all ſuch as are within the *Church*, are undoubtedly ſaved? For he only ſaith, *That no man can be ſaid ſimply to be out of the viſible Church, that is baptized, and holds the Foundation.* The moſt then that can be inferred meerly from being within the *Church*, is only, the *poſſibility* of *Salvation*, notwithſtanding which, I ſuppoſe you will not deny, but many who have a poſſibility of Salvation, may yet certainly periſh. For many may hold the *Foundation* it ſelf *doctrinally*, who may not hold it *ſavingly*; and therefore it is a pitiful inference, becauſe he grants they are members of the

Church, therefore it follows from his Principles, *they cannot be lost*. But you are in a very sad condition, if you have no other ground for your *Salvation*, but being members of that which you account the *Catholick Church*. When
Joh. 15. 2. *Christ* himself saith, *Every branch in me, that beareth not fruit, he taketh away*; How much more such, who have nothing else to plead for their *Salvation*, but that they are in the *Church*? It is not therefore the bare *doctrinal* holding that *Faith* which makes them members of the *Church*, which can give them a title to *Salvation*; unless all sincere endeavours be used to find out, what
P. 324. the will of *God* is, and to practice it when it is known. But, you say, *Your leaders did not refuse the Churches instructions, for they taught as the Church taught for many hundred years together*; *and, What other means could they be bound to use than they did, to come to the knowledge of the Truth?* Yes, there were other means which they most supinely neglected themselves, and most dangerously with-held from others, *viz. the plain and undoubted word of God*, which is the only Infallible Rule of Faith. And let any *Church* whatsoever teach against this, it must incurr the same *Anathema* which S. *Paul* pronounces against *an Angel from Heaven*, if he teaches any other Doctrine. Did those then take care of their own, and others souls, whose greatest care was to *lock* the *Scripture* up from the view of the people, and minded it so little themselves; which yet alone *is able to make men wise to salvation*. But you take the greatest advantage of his *vindication* of S. *Cyprian* and his followers,
Ibid. for therein you say, *He vindicates more the* Roman-Catholick *Doctors, who had always the universal practice of the Church on their side which they opposed*; *and condemns Protestants, because, if* S. Cyprian's *followers were in such danger for opposing the whole Church, so must they be too, who, you say, have opposed the Churches Instruction given them by the voice of a General Council.* But, Who is so blind as not to discern that all this proceeds upon a palpable begging the Question, *viz.* that the *whole Church* is of your side, and against us? which I have so often discover'd to be a notorious falshood, that there is no necessity at all here to repeat it. But, if we grant you that liberty to suppose your selves to be the *whole and only Church*, you will not more easily acquit all your *Doctors*, than condemn *Protestants*, both teachers and people. However, by this we see, that you have no other way to do the one, or the other; but by supposing what you can never prove, and which none in their wits will ever grant you.

The greatest part of the thirty seventh Paragraph in his Lordships Book, is (you
P. 325. say) *taken up with personal matters, and matters of fact, in which you will not interpose*; and you might as well have spared your pains in that which you touch at, since they are spent only upon a bare asserting the *Greek Church to be guilty of fundamental errours* (which we have at large disproved at the
P. 324. very beginning; but, as his Lordship sayes, *you labour indeed but like a horse in a Mill*; *no farther at night than at noon*; *the same thing over and over again*; and so we find it almost to the end of your Book) *and as vain an attempt to clear your Church from any errour endangering Salvation.* For, Whether the errours of your *Church* be *fundamental* in themselves, or only by reduction and consequence; whether you hold all *fundamental points* literally, or no; yet if we prove you guilty of any *gross*, *dangerous*, and *damnable errours* (as his
P. 320. Lordship asserts you are) that will be abundantly sufficient to our purpose, that, *Yours cannot possibly be any safe way to Salvation.* And, although we should grant your *Church* right in the exposition of the *three Creeds*, yet if you assert any other *errours* of a dangerous nature, your right exposition of them cannot secure the *souls* of men from the *danger* they run themselves upon, by embracing the other. So much for the Argument drawn from the *possibility of Salvation* in the *Roman Church*.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The Safety of the Proteſtant Faith.

The ſufficiency of the Proteſtant Faith to Salvation, manifeſted by diſproving the Cavils againſt it. T. C.*'s tedious Repetitions paſſed over. The Argument from Poſſeſſion at large conſider'd. No Preſcription allowable, where the Law hath antecedently determined the right. Of the Infallibility of Oral Tradition. That, contrary to the received Doctrine of the* Roman *Church; and in it ſelf unreaſonable. The Grounds of it examined. The ridiculouſneſs of the Plea of bare Poſſeſſion, diſcovered: General Anſwers returned to the remaining Chapters, conſiſting wholly of things already diſcuſſed. The place of S.* Cyprian *to* Cornelius *particularly vindicated. The proof of Succeſſion of Doctrine lyes on the Romaniſts by their own Principles.*

§. 1. ALthough this Subject hath been ſufficiently cleared in the Controverſie, concerning the reſolution of Faith; yet the nature of our task requires that we ſo far reſume the debate of it, as any thing undiſcuſſed already offers it ſelf to conſideration. For I cannot think it a civil way of treating the Reader, to cloy him with Tautologies, or Repetitions; nor can I think it a way to ſatisfie him, rather by ſome incidental paſſages, than by a full and free debate. In all thoſe things then, which we have had occaſion to handle already, I ſhall remit the Reader to the precedent diſcourſes; but whatever hath the face of being new and pertinent, I ſhall readily examine the force of it. The occaſion of this freſh Debate was a new Queſtion of the *Lady*; *Whether ſhe might be ſaved in the Proteſtant Faith?* In anſwering whereof, you ſay, *The parties conferring are put into new heats*; *Upon my ſoul* (*ſaid the Biſhop*) *you may. Upon my ſoul* (*ſaid Mr.* Fiſher) *there's but one ſaving Faith, and that's the Roman.* Since the confidence ſeems equal on both ſides, we muſt examine, Which is built on the ſtronger reaſon. And his Lordſhip's comes firſt to be examined; which he offers very freely to examination. *For*, ſaith he, *to believe the Scripture and the Creeds; to believe theſe in the ſenſe of the Ancient Primitive Church; to receive the four great General Councils ſo much magnified by Antiquity; to believe all points of Doctrine generally received as fundamental in the Church of Chriſt, is a Faith, in which to live and dye, cannot but give Salvation. And therefore*, ſaith he, *I went upon ſure ground in the adventure of my ſoul upon that Faith. Beſides, in all the points controverted between us, I would fain ſee any one point maintain'd by the Church of* England, *that can be proved to depart from the foundation. You have many dangerous errours about the very foundation, in that which you call the* Roman *Faith; but there I leave you to look to your own ſoul, and theirs whom you ſeduce. Thus far his Lordſhip.* Two things you ſeem to anſwer to this. 1. *That ſuch a Faith may not be ſufficient.* 2. *That ours is not ſuch a Faith.* 1. *That ſuch a Faith may not be ſufficient, becauſe you ſuppoſe it neceſſary to believe the Infallibility of the preſent Church, and General Councils*: But that we are now excuſed from a freſh enquiry into; but you would ſeem to inferr it from his own principles *of ſubmiſſion to General Councils.* But by what peculiar Arts you can thence draw, that ſome thing elſe is neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation beſides what hath been owned as Fundamentals in all ages, I am yet to learn. And ſure you were much to ſeek for Arguments, when you could not diſtinguiſh between the neceſſity of external ſubmiſſion and internal aſſent. P. 328.

§. 2. But the ſecond is the main thing you quarrel with, *viz. That the Engliſh-Proteſtant Faith is really and indeed ſuch a Faith*: and this you undertake at large

P. 329. large to diſprove. You ask firſt, *Whether we believe all Scripture, or only a part of it?* we anſwer, All without exception that is *Scripture, i. e.* hath any evidence that ever it was of *Divine Revelation*. *In this*, you ſay, *we profeſs more than we can make good, ſeeing we refuſe many books owned for Canonical by the Primitive Church, and imbrace ſome which were not.* But in both you aſſert that, which we are ſure you are never able to defend; ſince we are content to put it upon as fair a tryal as you can deſire, *viz.* That the *Church of England* doth fully agree with the *Primitive Church*, as to the *Canon* of *Scripture*. Which hath been already made good by the ſucceſsful diligence of a learned *Biſhop* of our *Church*, to whom I refer you either for ſatisfaction or confuſion. But you are the men whoſe bare words and bold affirmations muſt weigh more than the greateſt evidence of reaſon or *Antiquity*. You love to pronounce, where you are loth to prove; and think to bear men down with confidence, where you are afraid to enter the liſts. But our Faith ſtands not on ſo ſandy a Foundation to be blown down with your biggeſt words; which have that property of wind in them to be leight and loud. When you will attempt to prove that the *Books* call'd *Apocrypha* have had an equal teſtimony of Divine Authority with thoſe we receive into the *Canon* of *Scripture*, you may meet with a further Anſwer upon that Subject. Juſt as much you ſay to diſprove *our believing Scripture, and the Creeds in the Primitive Church*; For, you ſay, *The Fathers oppoſe us*, we deny it: you ſay, *The Councils condemn us*, we ſay and prove the contrary. You offer again

Biſhop *Coſins* Scholaſtical Hiſtory of the Canon of Scripture.

P. 330. at ſome broken evidences of the *Popes Supremacy from Councils and Fathers*; but thoſe have been diſcuſſed already: and the ſenſe of the *Church* at large manifeſted to be contrary to it. But I fear your matters lye very ill concocted upon your ſtomach, you bring them us ſo often up; but I am not bound to dance in a *circle* becauſe you do ſo. And therefore I proceed; but

P. 331. when I hope to do ſo, you pull me back again to the *Infallibility of Councils*

P. 332. and the *Church*, the queſtion of *Fundamentals* and the *Greek Church*; and ſcarce a page between, but in comes again the *Popes Supremacy* as freſh, as if

P. 334. it had been nover handled before. But I aſſure you after this rate, I wonder

P. 335. you ever came to an end, for you might have writ all your life time after that manner. For the *decretal Epiſtles* (thoſe impregnable teſtimonies) S. *Cyprian*, *Optatus*, *Hierom*, *Auſtin*, *the Council of Sardica*, *Epheſus*, *Chalcedon*, and all the baffled and impertinent proofs you think on, muſt be preſſed to do new ſervice, though they had run out of the *Field* before. And this you call a General Conſent of the *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church*; but I muſt beg the Reader not to be ſcared with theſe *vizards*, for if he touches them they fall off, and then you will ſee them bluſh that they are ſo often abuſed to ſo ill an end. But this is not the only ſubject (*viz.* the *Popes Supremacy*) which you give us ſo often over, but, within a page or two

P. 337. following, *enter* again *worſhip* of *Images* with as much ceremony as if it had never appeared; but till you have Anſwered what I have ſaid already, all that you have here is vain and impertinent: in the next page *enter*

P. 338. *Tranſubſtantiation*: in the following, *enter* again *Infallibility* of *Councils*, *Reſolution of Faith*, *Apocrypha books*, *Fundamentals*, *Communion in one kind*, &c. to the end of the Chapter. In all which I find but two things new, the one about *Purgatory*, which we ſhall meet with again; and the other

P. 353. you call a *Note* only by the way, but it is ſo rare a one, it ought to be conſidered.

§. 3. Which is, *That Proteſtants ought to prove their Faith agreeable to that of the Primitive Church by ſpecial undeniable evidence; but they have not the like reaſon to require it of you Catholicks* (good reaſon for it) *but*, you ſay, *not that you are unable to do it*, (no, who would ever ſuſpect that, who reads your book?) *but becauſe you are in full and quiet poſſeſſion of your Faith, Religion,*

Religion, Church, &c. *by immemorial tradition and ſucceſſion from your Anceſtours, that you do, upon that ſole ground of quiet poſſeſſion, juſtly preſcribe againſt your Adverſaries. And your plea,* you ſay, *muſt in all Law and equity be admitted for good, till they do by more pregnant and convincing arguments diſprove it, and ſhew that your poſſeſſion is not* bonæ fidei, *but gain'd by force or fraud, or ſome other wrongful and unallowed means.* To this, becauſe I have not yet conſidered it, I ſhall now return the fuller Anſwer. And it appears that the proof lyes upon you: For they who challenge *full and quiet poſſeſſion* by vertue of *immemorial tradition* and *ſucceſſion* from their *Anceſtours*, ought to produce the conveyance of that *tradition* from him who alone could inveſt them in that poſſeſſion. For although this title of *poſſeſſion* be of late ſo much inſiſted on by thoſe who ſee the weakneſs of other Arguments and are aſhamed to uſe them, yet whoſoever throughly ſearches it, will find it as weak and ridiculous as any other. For it is plain in this caſe the full *right* depends not upon meer *occupancy*, but a *title* muſt be pleaded, to ſhew that the poſſeſſion is *bonæ fidei*; ſo that the Queſtion comes from the bare *poſſeſſion* to the *goodneſs* of the title and the validity of it in juſtice and equity. Your title then is *immemorial tradition* from your *Anceſtours*: but here ſeveral things are to be *conteſted*, before your *preſcription* be allowed, 1. That no *antecedent Law* hath determin'd contrary to what you challenge by vertue of *poſſeſſion*. For if it hath, no *preſcription* is allowable in it. For, *preſcription* can only take place where the *Law* allows a liberty for *preſcription*; but if the *Law* hath antecedently determin'd againſt it, *poſſeſſion* ſignifies nothing, but the liberty to make good the *Title*. Would any man be ſo mad, as to think that *preſcription* of threeſcore years would have been ſufficient in the *Judaical Law*, when all poſſeſſions were to return to their firſt owners by *Law* at every year of *Jubilee*? So then the matter to be enquired here, is, What liberty of *preſcription* is allowed by vertue of the *Law* of *Chriſt*; for ſince he hath made *Laws* to Govern his *Church* by, it is moſt ſenſleſs pleading *preſcription*, till you have particularly examin'd, how far ſuch *preſcription* is allowed by him. Let us then ſuppoſe, that any of the matters in difference between us, are one way or other determined by him, *viz.* Whether the *Biſhop of Rome* be *Head* of the *Church* or no, Whether the preſent *Church* be *Infallible* or no. What do you ſay? Hath he determined theſe things, or hath he not? If he hath determined them one way or other, it is to no purpoſe in the world to plead *poſſeſſion* or *preſcription*; for theſe ſignifie nothing againſt *Law*. So that the queſtion muſt be wholly removed from the *plea* of *poſſeſſion*, and it muſt be tryed upon this *iſſue*, whether *Chriſt* by his *Law* hath determined on your ſide or ours? It may be you will tell me, *That in this caſe preſcription interprets Law, and that the Churches poſſeſſion argues it was the will of Chriſt.* But ſtill the proof lyes upon your ſide, ſince you run your ſelf into new bryars; for you muſt prove that there is no way to interpret this *Law*, but by the practice of the *Church*, and which is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of all, That the *Church* cannot come into the poſſeſſion of any thing, but what was originally given her by the *Legiſlator*. Which is a task neceſſarily incumbent on you to prove, and I ſuppoſe you will find ſo much difficulty in it, that you had as good run back to *Super hanc Petram*, and *Paſce oves*, as undertake to manage it. He that undertakes to prove it impoſſible that the *Church* ſhould claim *poſſeſſion* by an undue title; muſt prove it impoſſible, that the *Church* ſhould ever be deceived. And herein we ſee the excellent way of this proof. For ſuppoſe the matter in diſpute be the *Roman Churches Infallibility, this*, you ſay, *you are in poſſeſſion of* (though that be the thing in queſtion), well, we will ſuppoſe it, that we may diſcern your proofs. I demand then, On what account do you challenge this? you ſay, *By preſcription.* I further ask, How you prove this *preſcription* ſufficient?

ſufficient? you ſay, *Becauſe the Church cannot challenge any thing but what belongs to her.* I demand a proof of that: your Anſwer muſt be, *Becauſe the Church cannot be deceived*; ſo that the proof at laſt comes to this, *The Church is Infallible becauſe ſhe is Infallible.*

§. 4. Well, but ſuppoſe this *Infallibility* challenged, be only an *Infallibility* of *Tradition*, and not a *Doctrinal Infallibility* in either *Pope* or *Councils*; Yet ſtill I am as unſatisfied as ever. For I ask, Whether am I bound to believe what the preſent Church delivers to be Infallible? *Yes.* On what account am I bound to believe it? *Becauſe the preſent Church cannot be deceived in what the Church of the former age believed, nor that in the preceding, and ſo up till the time of Chriſt.* But, 1. How can you aſſure me, the preſent *Church* obliges me to believe nothing, but only *what, and ſo far*, as it received it from the former *Church?* What evidence can you bring to convince me, both that the *Church* alway obſerved this *rule*, and could never be deceived in it? For I ſee the *Roman Church* aſſerts, that things may be *de fide* in one age, which were not in another; at leaſt *Pope, and Councils* challenge this, and this is the common Doctrine maintained there, and others are looked on as no members of their *Church* who aſſert the contrary; but as perſons, at leaſt *meritoriouſly*, if not *actually*, excommunicate. Where then ſhall I ſatisfie my ſelf what the ſenſe of your *Church* is, as to this paricular? Muſt I believe a very few perſons whom the reſt diſown as Heretical and Seditious perſons? or ought I not rather to take the judgement of the greateſt and moſt approv'd perſons in that *Church?* And theſe diſown any ſuch Doctrine; but aſſert that the *Church* may determine things *de fide* which were not ſo before. in which caſe I ask, Whether, when a thing is *de novo* determined to be *de fide*, that *Church* believed as the precedent did, or no? If it did, How comes any thing to be *de fide* which was not before? If it did not, What aſſurance can I have that every age of the *Church* believes juſt as the *precedent* did, and no otherwiſe? when I ſee they profeſs the contrary. And if a thing may be *de fide* in one age, which was not in a foregoing, then a *Church* may deliver that as a matter of Faith at one time, which was never accounted ſo before: by which means the preſent *Church* may oblige me to believe that as a matter of *Faith* which never was ſo in *Chriſt* or the *Apoſtles* times, and ſo the *Infallibility* on the account of *Tradition* is deſtroyed. 2. What ſecurity is there, that in no age of the *Church* any practices ſhould come in, which were not uſed in the precedent? You may ſay, *Becauſe they could not be deceived what their fore-Fathers did*; but that ſatisfies not, unleſs you prove that all the *Church* in every age looked upon it ſelf as obliged to do nothing at all, but what their *fore-Fathers* did. For although they might know never ſo much what was done by them, if they did not judge themſelves bound to obſerve unalterably what they did, this doth not hinder at all, but new *cuſtoms* and opinions might be introduced in the *Church.* And therefore I cannot but juſtly wonder, that any men of parts who profeſſedly diſown the vulgar wayes of eſtabliſhing the *Roman Church* ſhould think to ſatisfie themſelves with *Oral Tradition*, and cry it up as ſo impregnable a thing. *Becauſe no age of the Church can be deceived in what the foregoing did and taught.* Whereas a very little of that reaſon, which theſe men pretend to, might acquaint them, that the *force* of it doth not lye in their *capacity* to know what was done by others, but in their *obligation* not to vary at all from it. For the main weight of the Argument lyes here, *That nothing hath been changed in the Faith or Practice of the Church*, which being the thing to be proved, the bare knowledge of what was believed or practiſed, is not ſufficient to prove it; for men may know very well what others believe and do, and yet may believe and do quite contrary themſelves. But the only thing to be proved in this caſe is, That every age of the *Church*, and all perſons in it looked upon themſelves

ſelves as obliged, not to vary in any thing from the Doctrine or practice of the precedent age. And I pray let me know by what demonſtrative *medium* can this be proved; for no leſs than *demonſtrations* are ſpoken of by the magnifiers of this way; although there be ſo little evidence in it, that it cannot work but upon a very weak underſtanding. Muſt that *obligation*, to obſerve all which the *precedent age* believed or practiſed be proved by *reaſon*, *particular teſtimony*, or *univerſal tradition*? And let the extollers of this way take their choice, ſo they will undertake to bring evidence equal to the weight which depends upon it. It is hard to conceive what *reaſon* ſhould inforce it, but ſuch as proves the impoſſibility of the contrary: And they have *underſtandings* of another *mould* from others, who can conceive it impoſſible that men ſhould not think themſelves *obliged* to *believe* and do all juſt as their Predeceſſors did. If *particular teſtimonies* could be produced, they ſignifie no more, than their own judgements; but we are enquiring for the judgement of every age of the *Church*, and the perſons who live in it. And to prove an *univerſal tradition* of this *obligation* is the moſt difficult task of all, for it depends upon the truth of that which is to be proved by it. For if they did not think themſelves *obliged* to believe and do what their Predeceſſors did, they could not think themſelves bound to deliver ſuch an *obligation* to their *poſterity* to do it. And therefore you muſt firſt prove the *obligation* it ſelf, before you can prove the *univerſal tradition* of it. For although one age may deliver it, yet you cannot be aſſured that a former age did it to them; unleſs you can prove, the ſame ſenſe of this *obligation* ran through them all. But this is ſo far from being an *univerſal tradition*, that the preſent age from which it begins was never agreed in it, as I have ſhewed already.

§. 5. 3. It is to no purpoſe to prove the *impoſſibility* of *motion*, when I ſee men move: no more it is to prove that no *age* of the *Church* could vary from the foregoing, when we can evidently prove that they have done it. And therefore this Argument is intended only to *catch* eaſie minds that care not for a ſearch into the Hiſtory of the ſeveral *ages* of the *Church*, but had rather ſit down with a ſuperficial ſubtilty than ſpend time in further enquiries. For this Argument proceeds juſt as if men ſhould prove the world *eternal* by this *medium*; The preſent age ſees no alteration in it, and they could not be deceived in what their fore-fathers believed, nor they in theirs, and ſo on *in infinitum*; for no men did ever ſee the world made: and therefore it was never made, and ſo eternal. But if we go about to prove by reaſon the production of the *world*, or by *Scripture* to ſhew that it was once made, then this *oral tradition* is ſpoiled. And ſo it is in the preſent caſe; Theſe men attempt to prove there could never be any alteration in the Faith or practice of the *Church* ſince *Chriſts* time; *for the preſent age delivers what it had from the precedent, and ſo up till the firſt inſtitution of the Church:* but in the mean time, if we can evidently prove that there hath been ſuch alterations in the *Church*, then it is to no purpoſe to prove that impoſſible which we ſee actually done. And this appears, not only becauſe the *Scripture* ſuppoſes a *degeneracy* in the Chriſtian *Church*, which could never be, if every age of the *Church* did infallibly *believe* and *practiſe* as the precedent up to *Chriſts* time did; but becauſe we can produce clear evidence, that ſome things are delivered by the preſent *Church* which muſt be brought in by ſome age ſince the time of *Chriſt*. For which I ſhall referr you to what I have ſaid already concerning *Communion in one kind*, *Invocation of Saints*, *and Worſhip of Images*. In all which I have proved evidently, that they were not in *uſe* in ſome ages of the *Chriſtian Church*; and it is as evident that theſe are delivered by the preſent *Church*; and therefore this principle muſt needs be falſe. For by theſe things it appears, that one *age* of the *Church* may differ in practice or opinion from another, and therefore this *oral tradition* cannot be in-

fallible. And yet this is the only way whereby a *prescription* may be allowed, for this offers to give a sufficient *title* if it could be made good. But *bare possession* in matters of Religion is a most senseless plea; and which would just fit *Heathenism* and *Mahumetism* as well as your *Church*.

§. 6. 2. It were worth knowing, What you mean *by full and quiet possession of your Faith, Religion, and Church, which you say you were in.* Either you mean, that you did believe the Doctrines of your *Church* your selves, or that we were bound to believe them too If you mean only the former, you are in as full *possession* of them as ever, for I suppose all in your *Church* do believe them; if you intend by this *possession*, that we ought to *believe* them because you did, this is a *prescription* indeed, but without any ground or reason. For even *Tertullian* whom you cite for *prescribing* against *Hereticks*, says, *That nothing can be prescribed against truth*, Non spatium temporum, non patrocinia personarum, non privilegium regionum. *Neither length of time, nor authority of persons, nor priviledge of places.* If you say, *It was truth you were in possession of*, that is the thing to be proved; and if you can make that appear we will not disturb your *possession* at all. But you must be sure to prove it by something else besides your *quiet and full possession*; unless you can prove it impossible that you should be possessed of falshoods; But we have evidently shewn the contrary already. And if we examine a little further what this *possession is*, we shall see what an excellent *right* it gives you to prescribe by. You were possessed of your *Faith*, *Religion*, and *Church*, *i. e.* you did believe the *Roman Church infallible*, you believed the *Popes Supremacy*, *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, *&c.* And what then? Do you not believe them still? Yes doubtless. But, What is your quarrel with us then? Do we hinder you the *Possession* of them? *No, but we ought to believe them too.* But, Why so? *because you are in possession of them.* What, Must we then believe whatever you do, whether it be true or false? If this be the meaning of your *Possession*, you ought well to prove it, or else we shall call it *Usurpation*. For it is a most ridiculous thing for you to talk of *Possession*, when the Question is, Whether there be any such things in the world or no, as those you say you are possessed of? We deny your *Churches Infallibility*, the *Popes Supremacy*, *Purgatory*, *&c.* You must first prove there are such things *in rerum naturâ*, as *Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation*, *&c.* before you can say, you are *possessed of them*: You must convince us, that your *Church* is *Infallible*, and that the *Pope* was made *Head* of the *Church by Christ*, and then we will grant you are in full possession of them, but not before. So that you see, the Question is not concerning the manner of *Possession*, but of the things themselves, which you call your *Faith*, *Religion*, and *Church*, in opposition to ours; and therefore it is impossible to plead *Prescription*, where there never was any *Possession* at all. And therefore you clearly mistake when you call us, *The Aggressors*, for you are plainly the *Imposers* in this case, and quarrel with us for not believing what you would have us; and therefore you are bound to prove, and not we. So that there is nothing you could challenge any *Possession* of in the *Church* of *England*, but some *Authority* which the *Pope* had, which you elsewhere confess *he might be deprived of, as he was in King* Henry's *time*; and which we offer to prove that he was not *Possessor bonæ fidei* of, but that he came to it by *fraud* and *violence*, and was deprived of it by a *legal Power*. Thus I have fully examined your Argument from *Possession*, because it presents us with something which had not been discussed before.

Tertul. de virg. veland. cap. 1.

§. 7. But having taken a view of all that remains, I find that it consists of a bare Repetition of the Controversies before discussed, especially concerning the *certainty* and *grounds of Faith*, the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, and *General Councils*, and the *Authority* of the *Roman Church*; So that if you had

had not an excellent faculty of ſaying moſt, where there is leaſt occaſion, I ſhould wonder at your deſign in ſpending ſeveral *Chapters* in giving the ſame things, under other words. Unleſs it were an ambition of anſwering every clauſe in his Lordſhips Book, which carried you to it, though you only gave over and over what you had ſaid in many places before. Which is a piece of *vanity* I neither envy you for, nor ſhall I ſtrive to imitate you in; having made it my endeavour to lay thoſe grounds in the handling each Controverſie, that there ſhould not need any ſuch fruitleſs repetitions as you here give us. His Lordſhip, though he complains much of it, was forced by his *Adverſaries* importunity to return the ſame Anſwers in effect, which had been given before by him in the proper places; but, whoſoever compares what his Lordſhip ſaith, with what you pretend to anſwer, will find no neceſſity at all of my undergoing the ſame tedious and wearisome task. Inſtead therefore of a particular Anſwer, I ſhall give only ſome *general ſtrictures* on what remains of theſe ſubjects, where there is any appearance of difficulty; and conclude all with the examination of your *Defence* of *Purgatory*, that being a ſubject which hath not yet come under our enquiry. Your main buſineſs is to perſwade us, *that yours is the only ſaving Faith*; which you prove by this, *The ſaving Faith is but one, yours is confeſſed by us to be a ſaving Faith ſtill; therefore yours is the only ſaving Faith.* P. 349. But if you had conſidered on what that confeſſion depends, you could have made no Argument at all of it; for, when we ſay, that your *Faith* is *ſaving*, we mean no more but this, that you have ſo much of the common truths of *Chriſtianity* among you, that there is a poſſibility for men to be ſaved in your *Church*; but, Doth this imply, that yours is a *ſaving Faith*, in that ſenſe wherein it is ſaid, There is but one *ſaving Faith?* for in that Propoſition it is underſtood of all thoſe common fundamental Truths, which the *Chriſtian Church* of all ages hath been agreed in. And the ſaying, There is but *one ſaving Faith*, is of the ſame ſenſe with the ſaying, There is but *one true Religion* in the world.

The ſubſtance of what you would inferr from the ſaying of *Athanaſius* his *Creed*, *Which if a man keeps whole and inviolate* (as you would have it) is this, P. 351. *That a man is equally bound to believe every Article of Faith.* But you cannot mean, that it is ſimply neceſſary to do it, for that you diſclaim elſewhere, by your diſtinction of *things neceſſary from the matter and the formal reaſon of Faith*; and therefore it can only be meant of ſuch to whom thoſe *objects* of *Faith* are ſufficiently propoſed, and ſo far we acknowledge it too, that it is neceſſary to Salvation for every man to believe that which he is convinced to be an object of Faith. For otherwiſe ſuch perſons muſt call in queſtion *God's Veracity*; but if you would hence make it neceſſary to believe all that your *Church* propoſes for matter of *Faith*, you muſt prove, that whatever your *Church* delivers, is as infallibly true, as if *God* himſelf ſpake; and when you can perſwade us of this, we ſhall believe whatever is propounded by her. When you ſay, *We cannot believe all Articles of Faith on the ſame formal reaſon, becauſe we deny the Churches Infallibility*, P. 352. it is apparent, that you make the *Churches* teſtimony the *formal reaſon* of Faith; and that you are bound to prove the *Church* abſolutely *Infallible*, before we can believe any thing on her account. Neither doth it follow, *Becauſe we deny that, therefore we pick and chuſe our Faith*; P. 353. for we believe all without reſervation, which you, or any man can convince us was ever revealed by *God*. As to what at large occurrs here again, about the *Infallibility of Councils*; there is nothing but what hath been ſufficiently anſwered on that ſubject; and ſo reſerving the Queſtion of *Purgatory*, which is here brought in by his Lordſhip, as a further Inſtance of the errours of *General Councils*; I paſs on to the two laſt Chapters: In which we meet again with the objected inconveniencies, *from queſtioning the Infallibility of the Church and Councils, That then Faith would be uncertain, and private* P. 355, &c. P. 373. P. 376, &c.

perſons might judge of Councils, and if they may err in one, they may err in all; as freſh as if they had never been heard of before. Only the Argument
P. 375. from *Rom.* 10. 15. *That becauſe none can preach except they be ſent, therefore*
P. 386. *the preſent Church is Infallible*, is both new and excellent, on which account I let it paſs. If your *Church*, with all her *Infallibility*, can do no more, as you confeſs, in reference to *Hereſies, but only ſecure the faithful members of the Church, who have due care of themſelves, and perform their duty well towards their lawful Paſtors*; you have little cauſe to boaſt of the great priviledge of it, and as little reaſon to contend for the neceſſity of it, ſince ſo much is done without it, and on ſurer grounds by the *Scriptures*, and the uſe of other means which fall ſhort of *Infallibility*.

§. 8. In the beginning of your laſt *Chapter*, we have a large diſpute concerning S. *Cyprian*'s meaning, in his 45 *Epiſtle* to *Cornelius*, where he ſpeaks *of the root and matrix of the Catholick Church, viz.* Whether by that, the *Roman Church* be underſtood or no? His Lordſhip ſaith, *Not*, and gives many reaſons for it; you maintain the contrary; but the buſineſs may be ſoon decided upon a true ſtate of the occaſion of writing that *Epiſtle*. Which in ſhort was this; It ſeems, Letters had been ſent in the name of *Polycarp Biſhop* of the *Colony* of *Adrumyttium*, directed to *Cornelius* at *Rome*; but *Cyprian* and *Liberalis* coming thither, and acquainting the *Clergy* there with the reſolution of the *African Biſhops* to ſuſpend communion either with *Cornelius*, or *Novatianus*, till the return of *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, who were ſent on purpoſe to give an account of the proceedings there, the *Clergy* of *Adrumyttium* upon this writing to *Rome*, direct their Letters not to *Cornelius*, but to the *Roman Clergy*. Which *Cornelius* (being it ſeems informed by ſome, as though it were done by S. *Cyprian's Counſel*) takes offence at, and writes to *Cyprian* about it. Who gives him in this *Epiſtle* the account of it, that it was only done, that there might be no diſſent among themſelves upon this difference at *Rome*, and that they only ſuſpended their ſentence till the return of *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, who might either bring them word that all was compoſed at *Rome*, or elſe ſatisfie them, who was the lawfully ordained *Biſhop*. And therefore, as ſoon as they underſtood that *Cornelius* was the lawful *Biſhop*, they unanimouſly declare for him, and order all Letters to be ſent to him, and that his communion ſhould be embraced. This is the ſubſtance of that *Epiſtle*. But, it ſeems *Cornelius* was moved at S. *Cyprian*'s ſuſpending himſelf, as though it were done out of diſ-favour to him; which *Cyprian* to clear himſelf of, tells him, That his deſign was only to preſerve the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*. *For*, ſaith he, *we give this advice to all thoſe who the mean time had occaſion to ſail to* Rome, ut Eccleſiæ Catholicæ radicem & matricem agnoſcerent & tenerent; *that they would acknowledge and hold to the root and matrix of the Catholick Church*, by which his Lordſhip underſtands, *the Unity of the Church Catholick*; you, *the particular Church of* Rome. But it is apparent, the meaning of this *Counſel* was, to prevent their participation in the *Schiſm*. So that if, upon their coming to *Rome*, the *Schiſmatical* party was evidently known from the other (which they might, I grant, ſoon underſtand there, by the circumſtances of affairs) they ſhould joyn themſelves with that *part* which preſerved the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*. Which I take to be the true meaning of S. *Cyprian*. But in caſe the matter ſhould prove diſputable at *Rome*, and the matter be referred to other *Churches*, then by virtue of this advice, they were bound to ſuſpend their communion with either party, till the *Catholick Church* had declar'd it ſelf. By this account of the buſineſs, all your Arguments come to nothing: for they only prove that which I grant, *viz. That in caſe it ap-*
P. 391. *peared at* Rome, *which was the Catholick party, they were to communicate with it*:
P. 392. but this was not, becauſe the *Catholick party* at *Rome* was the *root* and *ma-*

trix

trix of the *Catholick Church* (for on that account the party of *Novatianus* might have been ſo too, if *Novatianus* had been lawful *Biſhop*) but their holding to the *root* of the *Catholick Church*, would oblige them to communicate only with that *part*, which did preſerve the *Unity* of it. For the Controverſie now at *Rome* was between two *parties* both challenging an equal *right*; and therefore if S. *Cyprian* had only adviſed them to communicate with the *Roman Church*, becauſe that was the *root* and *matrix* of the *Catholick Church*, his advice had ſignified nothing; for the Queſtion was not between the *Church* of *Rome*, and other *Churches*, in which caſe it might have been pertinent to have ſaid, they ſhould adhere to the *Church* of *Rome*, becauſe that was the *root*, *&c.* But when the difference was at *Rome* it ſelf between two *Biſhops* there, this reaſon had been wholly impertinent; for the only reaſon proper in this caſe, muſt be ſuch as muſt *diſcriminate* the one *party* from the other, which this could not do, becauſe it was equally challenged by them both. And had belonged to one as well as the other, in caſe *Novatianus* had proved the lawful *Biſhop*, and not *Cornelius*. And therefore the ſenſe of *Cyprian*'s words muſt be ſuch as might give direction which party to joyn with at *Rome*, on which account they cannot import any priviledge of the *Church* of *Rome* over other *Churches*, but only contain this advice, that they ſhould hold to the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*, and communicate only with that *party* which did it. This reaſon is ſo clear and evident to me, that this place cannot be underſtood of any *priviledge* of the *Church* of *Rome*, above other *Churches*, that if there were nothing elſe to induce me to believe it, this were ſo pregnant, that I could not reſiſt the force of it.

But beſides this, his Lordſhip proves that elſewhere S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks in his own perſon with other *Catholick Biſhops*, *nos qui Eccleſiæ unius caput & radicem tenemus*, *we who hold the head and root of one Church*, by which it appears, he could not make the *Church* of *Rome* the *root and matrix of the Catholick*; this being underſtood of the *Unity and Society of the Catholick Church*, without relation to the *Church* of *Rome*: and S. *Cyprian* writes to *Cornelius*, that they had ſent *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus* to reduce the *Church* of *Rome* to the *Unity* and *Communion* of the *Catholick Church*; and becauſe no particular *Church* can be the *root* of the *Catholick*, and if any were, *Jeruſalem* might more pretend to it than *Rome*, and becauſe S. *Cyprian* and his *Brethren* durſt not have ſuſpended their communion at all, if they had looked on the *Church* of *Rome* as the *root and matrix of the Catholick*, as *Baronius* confeſſes they did, all which things are largely inſiſted on by his Lordſhip, and do all confirm, that hereby was not meant any Authority or Priviledge of the *Church* of *Rome* above other *Apoſtolical Churches*, which in reſpect of the leſſer *Churches* which came from them, are called *Matrices Eccleſiæ*, by *Tertullian* and others. But you are ſtill ſo very unreaſonable, that though no more be ſaid of the *Church* of *Rome*, than might be ſaid of any other *Apoſtolical Church*, yet becauſe it is ſaid of the *Church* of *Rome*, it muſt import ſome huge Authority, which if it had been ſaid of any other, would have been interpreted by your ſelves into nothing: For ſo do you deal with us here; for, becauſe it is ſaid, that they who joined with *Cornelius*, did preſerve the Unity of the *Catholick Church*, therefore it muſt needs be underſtood, that the *Roman Church* is the *root* of the *Catholick*. But he muſt have a very mean underſtanding, that can be ſwayed by ſuch trifles as theſe are: For, Was there not a *Catholick* and *Schiſmatical* party then at *Rome*? and if they who joyned with *Novatianus*, did ſeparate from the *Catholick Church*, then they who were in communion with *Cornelius*, muſt preſerve the *Unity* of it. And, Would not this Argument as well prove the *Catholick* party at *Carthage* to be the *root* and *matrix* of the *Catholick Church*, as at *Rome*? But ſuch kind

§. 9. P. 366.

Cypr. ep. 73.

P. 394.

kind of things muſt they deal with, who are reſolved to maintain a cauſe, and yet are deſtitute of better means to do it with. So that I cannot find any thing in all your Anſwer, but what would equally hold for any other *Church* at that time, which was ſo divided as *Rome* was; conſidering the great care
Part 2. ch. 2. ſect. 8, 9. that then was uſed to preſerve the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*. And what particularly S. *Cyprian*'s apprehenſion was concerning the *Nature* and *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*, we have at large diſcourſed already, to which place we referr the Reader, if he deſires any further ſatisfaction.

§. 10. P. 399, &c. Your whole *N.* 5. depends on perſonal matters concerning the *ſatisfaction* of the *Lady's conſcience*; but if you would thence inferr, *That ſhe did well to forſake the Proteſtant Communion*; you muſt prove that it can be no ſin to follow the dictates of an erroneous conſcience. For ſuch, we ſay, it was in her, and, you denying it, all this diſcourſe ſignifies nothing, but depends on the truth of the matters in controverſie between us. But you moſt notoriouſly impoſe on his Lordſhip, when, becauſe he aſſerts *the poſſibility of Salvation of ſome in your Church*, you would make him ſay, That it is no ſin to P. 401. joyn with your *Church*: You might as well ſay, Becauſe he hopes ſome who have committed *Adultery* may be ſaved, therefore it is no *ſin* to commit Adultery. So that while you are charging him *falſly* for allowing diſſimulation, you do that which is more, in ſaying that which you cannot but know to be a great untruth.

P. 402. If *our Religion be not the ſame with yours*, as you eagerly contend it is not, let it ſuffice to tell you, that our *Religion* is *Chriſtianity*, let yours be what it will. And if it pleaſe you better, to have a name wholly diſtinct from us, yours ſhall be called the *Roman Religion*, and ours the *Chriſtian*. If you judge us *of another Religion from yours, becauſe we do not believe all that you do*, we may judge you to have a different Religion from the *Chriſtian*, becauſe you impoſe more by your own confeſſion to be believed as neceſſary in order to Salvation, than ever *Chriſt* or the *Apoſtles* did. And certainly the main of any *Religion* conſiſts in thoſe things which are neceſſary to be believed in it, in order to eternal happineſs.

P. 403. In your following diſcourſe, you are ſo far from giving us *any hopes of peace with your Church*, that you plainly give us the reaſon, why it is vain to expect or deſire it; which is, that if your *Church* ſhould recede from any thing, it would appear ſhe had erred, and if that appears, farewel *Infallibility*; and then if that be once gone, you think all is gone. And while you maintain it, we are ſo far from hoping any peace with you, that the *Peace* of *Chriſtendom* may ſtill be joyned in the *Dutchmans* Sign with the *quadrature* of the *circle*, and the *Philoſophers Stone*, for the *ſign* of the *three hopeleſs things*.

How far we are bound *to ſubmit to General Councils*, hath been ſo fully cleared already, that I need not go about here to vindicate his Lordſhips Opinion from falſity or contradiction; both which you unreaſonably charge
P. 404, &c. it with, and that ſtill from no wiſer a ground, than not being able to diſtinguiſh between the ſubmiſſion of *Obedience* and *Faith*. For his Lordſhip ſaith, *It may be our duty not to oppoſe General Councils in caſe they err, and yet it may be no pride not to believe known and groſs errours of General Councils*; and I pray, What ſhadow of a contradiction is here? And if it be pride in
P. 406. us not to believe groſs errours impoſed on us, Is it not much more intolerable in them who offer to impoſe them? What Authority the *Pope* hath either to order or confirm *Councils*, it is not here a place to enter upon again, ſince it hath been ſo largely diſcourſed of in ſo many places. But you force me, though not to the repetition of matter, yet to the repeating my ſaying that I will not, oftener than I ſhould, but only to ſhew, how little you deſerve any further anſwer.

There

There is nothing now remaining to the end of your *Book*, which hath not been over and over, even in theſe *laſt Chapters*, but only a long diſcourſe touching *Succeſſion*, which you ſhew your ſelf, of how little importance it is, when, after you have endeavoured at large to prove the neceſſity of *perſonal Succeſſion*, you grant, *That it is not ſufficient without Succeſſion of Doctrine too*: And on that account you deny the *Greek Church* to have a true *Succeſſion*. And in vindication of *Stapleton*, you ſay, *All the Succeſſion which he and you contend for, is a Succeſſion of Paſtors, which hold entire both the Unity and the Faith of the Church.* So that it comes to this at laſt, that you are bound to prove a continual *Succeſſion* of all that which you call the Faith of your *Church* in every age from the *Apoſtles* times; if you would have us believe that Doctrine, or own your *Church* for the true *Church* of *Chriſt*. And therefore I conclude theſe general Anſwers with his Lordſhips words; *If* A. C. T. C. *or any Jeſuit can prove, that by a viſible continued Succeſſion from Chriſt or his Apoſtles to this day, either Tranſubſtantiation in the Euchariſt, or the Euchariſt in one kind, or Purgatory, or Worſhip of Images, or the Intention of the Prieſt of neceſſity in Baptiſm, or the Power of the Pope over a General Council, or his Infallibility with or without it, or his Power to depoſe Princes, or the publick Prayers of the Church in an unknown tongue, with divers other points have been ſo taught; I, for my part, will give the Cauſe.*

P. 409. P. 410. P. 411. P. 382.

CHAP. VI.

The Senſe of the Fathers concerning Purgatory.

The Advantage which comes to the Church of Rome, *by the Doctrine of Purgatory, thence the boldneſs of our Adverſaries in contending for it. The Senſe of the* Roman *Church concerning Purgatory, explained. The Controverſie between the Greek and Latin Church concerning it. The Difference in the Church of* Rome *about Purgatory. Some general Conſiderations about the Senſe of the Fathers, as to its being an Article of Faith. The Doubtfulneſs and Uncertainty of the Fathers Judgements in this particular, manifeſted by S.* Auſtin *the firſt who ſeemed to aſſert a Purgation before the day of Judgement. Prayer for the Dead uſed in the Ancient Church, doth not inferr Purgatory. The Primate of* Armagh *vindicated from our Adverſaries Calumnies. The general Intention of the Church diſtinguiſhed from the private Opinions of particular perſons. The Prayers of the Church reſpected the day of Judgement. The Teſtimonies of the Fathers in behalf of Purgatory, examined; particularly of the pretended* Dionyſius, Tertullian, *S.* Cyprian, Origen, *S.* Ambroſe, *S.* Hierom, *S.* Baſil, Nazianzen, Lactantius, Hilary, Gregory Nyſſen, &c. *And not one of them aſſerts the Purgatory of the Church of* Rome. *S.* Auſtin *doth not contradict himſelf about it. The Doctrine of Purgatory no elder than* Gregory I. *and built on Credulity and Superſtition. The Churches Infallibility made at laſt the Foundation of the belief of Purgatory. The Falſity of that Principle: and the whole concluded.*

§. 1. THeſe general Anſwers being diſpatched, there remains only now this Queſtion concerning *Purgatory* to be diſcuſſed. Which being the great *Diana* of your *Church*, no wonder you are ſo much diſpleaſed at his Lordſhip for ſpeaking againſt it; for by that means *your craft is in danger to be ſet at nought.* There being no Opinion in your *Church* which brings in a more conſtant revenue, by *Maſſes for the dead*, and *Indulgences*, beſides *Caſualties*, and *Deodands*, by dying perſons, or their friends, in hopes of a ſpeedier releaſe out of the pains of *Purgatory*. So that if this

this Opinion were once out of *Countenance* in the world, you would loſe one of the beſt arts you have of upholding the *Grandeur* of your *Church*. For then farewel *Indulgences*, and years of *Jubilee*; farewel all thoſe rich *Donations* which are given by thoſe at their death, who hope by that means to get the ſooner out of the *Suburbs* of *Hell*, to a place of reſt and happineſs. For, What Engine could poſſibly be better contrived to extort the largeſt gifts from thoſe whoſe riches were as great as their ſins, than to perſwade them, that by that means they would be ſooner delivered out of the *Flames* of *Purgatory*, and need not doubt but they ſhould come to Heaven at laſt? And, Would not they be accounted great *Fools*, that would not live as they pleaſed in this world, as long as they could *buy* themſelves out of the pains of another? And by this means your *Church* hath not only *eaten*, but *grown fat, by the ſins of the people*; it being truly obſerved by *Spalatenſis*, *That the Doctrine of Purgatory hath been that which hath moſt inriched the Church of* Rome; which he gives as the reaſon of the moſt zealous contending for that Doctrine among thoſe of your party, who find ſo much advantage by it. And we might eaſily believe there was ſomething extraordinary in it, when you tell us; *It is therefore firmly to be believed by all Catholicks, that there is a Purgatory; yea, we are as much bound to believe it, as we are bound to believe (for Inſtance) the Trinity or Incarnation it ſelf: becauſe, ſince it is defined by the Church, we cannot lawfully, or without ſin and peril of damnation deny or queſtion this doctrine.* We had need then look to our ſelves, who look on this Doctrine as a meer figment, that hath no foundation at all either in *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, or *Tradition* of the *Primitive Church*; but much more had you need to look to your ſelves, who dare with ſo much confidence obtrude ſo deſtructive a Doctrine to a *Chriſtian life*, without any evidence of the truth of it, to be believed as much *as the Trinity or Incarnation it ſelf*; which expreſſions take them in the mildeſt ſenſe you can give them, carry a moſt inſufferable boldneſs with them. But theſe are not all the bold words which you utter on this Subject; for you ſay elſewhere, *That* Bellarmin *doth not more boldly, than truly affirm, yea evidently prove, that all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, did conſtantly teach Purgatory from the very Apoſtles times, and conſequently that it muſt be held for an Apoſtolical Tradition, or nothing can be.* So then, if confidence would carry it, we muſt not only tremble at the fears of *Purgatory*; but we muſt firmly believe it as *an Article of Faith*, and as a moſt undoubted *Apoſtolical Tradition*.

De Repub. Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 8. ſect. 73.

P. 371.

P. 350.

§. 2. But before we can digeſt theſe things, we muſt ſee a little more ground for them, than as yet we do; and therefore you muſt be content to hear our reaſons, Why we neither look on it as a *matter* of *Faith* or *Apoſtolical tradition*; in order to which nothing is more neceſſary, than to enquire what you mean by *Purgatory*. For as long as you can ſhelter your ſelves under General words, you think you are ſafe enough; but when we once bring you to a fuller explication of your meaning, *Purgatory* it ſelf is not half ſo evident as thoſe *impoſtures* are whereby you would maintain it. But for our clear underſtanding this Controverſie, we muſt find out what your *Doctrine* is concerning it; for, as confident as you are of it, there are not a few among you who are afraid to declare what you mean by it, leſt by that means the world ſhould ſee how far it is from having foundation either in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. We are therefore told by ſome who either are aſhamed of the Doctrine it ſelf, or loth to betray their cauſe (by declaring themſelves) that your *Church* requires no more than to believe that there is a *Purgatory*, for which they avouch the *Council* of *Trent*, which only defines *That the ſound Doctrine concerning Purgatory ſhould be taught*. This was indeed neceſſary to be ſaid by ſuch who do

not

not at all believe the *Roman Doctrine* concerning it, what ever they pretend; but rather agree with the *Greek Church* about the middle *ſtate* of *ſouls*. But although the *Council* of *Trent* did not expreſly define what they meant by *Purgatory*; yet the ſenſe of the *Council* concerning it, is eaſie to be gathered from the comparing of places together in it. For the *Council* of *Trent* in the laſt *Seſſion* when it paſſed the decree of *Purgatory* referrs us to two things, by which we may fully underſtand the meaning of it; For in the Preface to the Decree, it ſaith, *That the Catholick Church had, in this and former Oecumenical Councils, taught that there was a Purgatory*; by which we may underſtand, What this *Purgatory* is, which was now decreed, and you ſay, we are bound to believe it as an Article of Faith. Now in all the former Decrees and *Anathematiſms* of the *Council*, there is no place which ſeems to concern the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, ſo much as the thirtieth *Anathema* of the ſixth *Seſſion* in theſe words, *Si quis ita reatum pœnæ æternæ deleri dixerit; ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exſolvendæ vel in hoc ſeculo vel in futuro in Purgatorio, antequam ad regna cœlorum aditus patere poſſit; Anathema ſit. If any one ſhall affirm that the guilt of eternal puniſhment is ſo forgiven, as that there remains no guilt of temporal puniſhment to be paid, either in this life, or hereafter in Purgatory; before there can be any entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven; let them be Anathema.* From whence it evidently follows, that the Doctrine of *Purgatory* as it is taught by the *Council* of *Trent* doth depend upon this principle, *That there is a guilt of temporal puniſhment remaining after the ſin is pardoned, which temporal puniſhment is to be ſatisfied for, either in this life, or in Purgatory.* So that all thoſe who are in *Purgatory* are there on that account, that they might ſatisfie the juſtice of *God* for the *temporal puniſhment* of ſin. For the *guilt* of mortal *ſin* being remitted by the merits of *Chriſt*, the puniſhment is ſuppoſed ſtill to remain, which being exchanged from *eternal* to *temporal* by the *keys* of the *Church*, this *puniſhment* remains to be ſatisfied for, in the pains of *Purgatory*. But this puniſhment being *temporal*, the *poſſibility* of a *releaſe* from them is neceſſarily ſuppoſed before the day of judgement; for the *Council* of *Trent* in the *Decree* of *Purgatory*, declares that the *ſouls* there detained are relieved by the *prayers of the Faithful, and ſpecially by the ſacrifice of the Altar. Which*, in the 22 Seſſion, it ſaith, *is offer'd* pro defunctis in Chriſto nondum ad plenum purgatis, *for the departed in Chriſt not yet fully purg'd.* So that the ſatisfaction of the *debt* of *temporal puniſhment which remains when the ſin is pardoned, and the tranſlation of ſouls from thence to Heaven by the prayers of the living and the ſacrifice of the Maſs*, are the main Foundations of the Doctrine of your *Church* concerning *Purgatory*.

§. 3. And this will further appear by the ſtate of the Controverſie between the *Greek* and *Latin Church* upon this Subject. For the main thing which the *Greeks* objected againſt the *Latins*, was this temporary puniſhment for ſin, in a future ſtate: For they ſay, in their *Apology* delivered into the *Council* of *Baſil*, *We own no Purgatory fire, nor any temporary puniſhment by fire which ſhall have an end; for we received no ſuch thing by tradition, nor doth the Eaſtern Church confeſs it.* And afterwards; *We deny that any ſouls paſs through this life to eternal fire; for in ſaying ſo, we ſhould weaken the conſent of the whole Church: and it is to be fear'd, if we ſhould aſſert ſuch a temporary fire, that people would be apt to believe that all the fire in the other life were only temporary; by which means they would fall into ſuch neglect and careleſneſs, that they would make the more fuel for eternal fire.* And therefore they conclude, *That they neither have nor ſhall aſſert any ſuch Purgatory fire.* But you would ſeem to perſwade us, *That the Conteſt between the Greeks and Latins was only, whether the fire of Purgatory were material or no*; For you ſay, *The Greeks in the Council of* Florence *never doubted in the leaſt meaſure,*

Apolog. Græcorum de Igne Purgat. p. 66. ed. Salmaſ.

P. 358.

nor denyed Purgatory it self, but only queſtion'd, Whether the fire were material or metaphorical. But if you ſpeak of thoſe *Greeks*, who held to what was generally received in the *Greek Church*; you are very much deceived therein, for the ſenſe of the *Greek Church* was fully delivered by them in this *Apology*, penned, as is ſuppoſed, by *Marcus Epheſius* but the year before at the *Council of Baſil*; and herein they not only diſpute againſt the *fire*, but againſt any ſuch *ſtate* of *purgation* after this life, by the undergoing any temporary puniſhment for ſin. For thus that *Apology* ends; *For theſe cauſes the Doctrine propoſed of a Purgatory fire is to be caſt out of the Church, as that which tends to ſlacken the endeavours of the diligent, and which hinders them from doing their utmoſt to purge themſelves in this life, ſince another purgation is expected after it.* Is not this plain enough for their denyal of any ſtate of *purgation* after this life, by which men might ſatisfie for the temporary puniſhment of ſin, and be tranſlated out of that ſtate to the *Kingdom of Heaven?* And thence, although in the *Bull* of *Union* publiſhed by *Eugenius* 4. at the concluding the *Florentine Council*, no more was concluded, *than that thoſe penitents who departed this life, before they had ſatisfied for their former ſins by worthy fruits of penance, ſhould have their ſouls purged after death*, pœnis purgatoriis, *with purgatory puniſhments*, yet *Marcus Eugenicus* utterly refuſed to ſubſcribe it thus; which certainly he would never have done if all the Controverſie had been only, *Whether the fire were real or metaphorical.* And the whole *Greek Church* utterly refuſed thoſe terms of union, and therefore *Alphonſus à Caſtro* recounts the denying *Purgatory* among the errours of the *Greeks*. The *Greeks* indeed do not believe that any ſouls enjoy the *beatifical Viſion* before the day of Judgement, and on that account they allow of *prayer for the dead*, not with any reſpect to a deliverance of ſouls out of *purgatory*, but to the participation of their happineſs at the *great Day*. But there is a great deal of difference between this Opinion, and that of your *Church*; for they believe all ſouls of believers to be in expectation of the *final Judgement*, but without any temporary puniſhment for ſin, or any releaſe from that puniſhment by the *prayers of the living*, which your *Church* aſſerts; and is the proper *ſtate* of the *Queſtion* concerning *Purgatory*. Which is not, Whether there be any *middle ſtate* wherein the ſouls of the Faithful may continue in expectation of the *final conſummation* of their happineſs at the *great day*; nor, Whether it be lawful in that ſenſe for the *Church* on earth to *pray* for *departed ſouls* in order to their final *juſtification* at the *day* of *Judgement*, or in St. *Pauls* language, *That God would have mercy on them in that day*; but, Whether there be ſuch a *ſtate*, wherein the ſouls of men undergo a *temporary puniſhment for ſin*, the guilt being pardoned, out of which they may be *releaſed* by the prayers of the *living*, and tranſlated from *Purgatory* to the *Kingdom of Heaven*, before the *day* of *Reſurrection*. This is the true ſtate of the *Queſtion* between us and the *Church* of *Rome*; and now we come to examine, Whether your Doctrine concerning *Purgatory* be either an *Article* of *Faith*, or *Apoſtolical Tradition*; which how confidently ſoever you may aſſert, we ſhall find your confidence built on very little reaſon.

Διὰ τὰ αὐτὰ οὖν καὶ τὸ προκείμενον δόγμα τοῦ καθαρτηρίου πυρὸς ἀποβλητέον ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὡς ῥοθυμίαν ἐμποιοῦν τοῖς σπουδαίοις, ὅπερ ἐστὶν αὐτὸν μὴ πάσῃ τρόποις ἀγωνίζεσθαι καὶ πάντα βίον ἑαυτὸν ἐκκαθαίρειν, ὡς προσδοκωμένης ἑτέρας καθάρσεως. P. 93.

Alphonſ. à Caſtro. l. 12. tit. purgat.

§. 4. Which we may the eaſier believe, ſince there are ſo many among your ſelves, who do not think themſelves obliged to own this Doctrine of your *Church* concerning *Purgatory*. Nay, we have not only the confeſſion of ſeveral of your party, that your Doctrine of *Purgatory* was not known in the *Primitive Church*, as *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, *Roffenſis*, *Polydore*, *&c.* and of others, that it cannot be ſufficiently proved from *Scripture*, as *Petrus à Soto*, *Perionius*, *Bulenger*, whoſe teſtimonies are produced by others; but there are

are ſome perſons of note among you, who have expreſly denyed the Doctrine it ſelf, and confuted the pretended reaſons which are given for it. *Petrus Picherellus*, ſaith, *There is no fuel to be found in Scripture, either to kindle or maintain the fire of Purgatory*; and which afterwards he largely diſproves in his excellent Diſcourſe *de Miſſâ*. *Father Barns* acknowledges, *That the puniſhment of ſouls in Purgatory, is a thing which lyes meerly in humane opinion, which cannot be firmly deduced from Scriptures, Fathers, or Councils. Yea*, (ſaith he, *with ſubmiſſion to better judgements*) *the oppoſite opinion ſeems more agreeable to them.* But later than theſe, you cannot but know, Who it is here at home, that hath not only pull'd down the ſuperſtructure, but raſed the very Foundations of your Doctrine of *Purgatory* in his diſcourſe *de medio Animarum ſtatu*: wherein he profeſſedly diſproves the Doctrine of your *Church* (though he is loth to own it to be ſo) in this particular, and ſhews at large, that it hath no foundation at all, either in *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, or *Reaſon*. But if your Doctrine of *Purgatory* be to be believed as an *Article of Faith*, and *Apoſtolical Tradition if any be*; How come theſe differences among your ſelves about it? How comes that Author not to be anſwered, and his reaſons ſatisfied? But if you be not agreed among your ſelves, What this *Article* of *Faith* is, you are moſt unreaſonable men, to tell us, We are as much bound to believe it as the *Trinity*, *or Incarnation*. We ask you, What it is we are bound to believe? You tell us, according to the ſenſe of your *Church*, *The puniſhment of ſouls in a future ſtate, out of which they may be delivered by the prayers of the Faithful, and tranſlated into the Kingdom of Heaven*; Another he denyes all this, and ſaith, We are in effect only bound to believe, That faithful *ſouls* do not enjoy their full happineſs till the *reſurrection*, and that there is no deliverance at all out of any ſtate in which mens ſouls are after death, till the day of Judgement; and that the prayers of the *Church*, only reſpect that *Day*; but that the former Doctrine is ſo far from being an *Article* of *Faith*, that it is contrary to *Scripture*, *Antiquity* and *Reaſon*. If ſuch a ſtate of expectation wherein faithful ſouls are at reſt (but according to different degrees of grace which they had at their departure hence, and look for at the *day* of *Reſurrection*, when they ſhall have a perfect conſummation of their bliſs) were all the *Purgatory* which your *Church* aſſerted, the breach might be far nearer cloſing as to this *Article*, than now it is. For although we find ſome particular perſons ready to give a fair and tolerable ſenſe of your Doctrine herein; yet we cannot be ignorant, that the *General apprehenſion* and *ſenſe* of your *Church* is directly contrary; and thoſe perſons who have diſcovered the *freedom* of their *judgements* as to this and other particulars, know how much it concerns them to keep a due diſtance from *Rome*, if they would *preſerve* the *freedom* of their *perſons*. But you are not one of thoſe that hath cauſe for any ſuch fears: for what ever *Bellarmin* ſaith, you are ready to ſwear to it, and accordingly ſet your ſelf to the defence of *Purgatory* upon his principles; which are far more ſuitable to the Doctrine of your *Church*, than to *Scripture* or *Antiquity*.

Picherellus de Miſſâ c. 2. p. 150.

Punitio ergo in Purgatorio eſt res in opinione humanâ poſita: quæ nec ex Scripturis nec Patribus, nec Conciliis dedu i poteſt firmiter: Immo, (ſalvo me ioris judicio) oppoſita ſententia eis conformior videtur. Barns Catholico. Rom. Pacif. ſect. 9. l. D. ad fin. Paralip.

§. 5. But becauſe this Controverſie is not managed between his Lordſhip and you about the ſenſe of the *Scripture*, but the *Fathers* concerning it; I muſt therefore enquire, Whether your Doctrine of *Purgatory* were ever owned by the *Fathers* as an *Article* of *Faith* or *Apoſtolical Tradition*. And that I may the more fully clear it, before I come to examine your proofs for it, I ſhall lay down ſome general conſiderations.

1. *Nothing ought to be looked on as an Article of Faith among the Fathers, but what they declare, that they believe on the account of Divine Revelation.* As to all other things which they aſſert, we may look on them as *private opinions*

opinions of *particular perſons*, but not as ſuch things which were received as *Articles of Faith*. For whatſoever is received as ſuch, it muſt be wholly on the account of *Gods revealing* it, who only can oblige us to believe with that aſſent which is required to *Faith*. And if it be ſo as to all other things, much more certainly as to the *future ſtate* of *ſouls*, of which we can know nothing certainly without *Divine Revelation*. For ſince the *remiſſion* of *ſins*, and the *happineſs* of the *future life*, depend upon the *goodneſs* and *mercy* of *God*, we can define nothing as to theſe things any further than *God* hath declared them. If *God* hath declared that *remiſſion* of *ſins* lyes in the taking away the *obligation* to *puniſhment*, it will be a contradiction to ſay, That he pardons thoſe whom he exacts the puniſhment of ſin from, purely to ſatisfie his *juſtice*; if he hath declared, that the *ſouls* of the faithful are in joy and felicity aſſoon as they are delivered out of this ſinful world, it is impoſſible they ſhould undergo *unſufferable pains*, though not to *eternity*. I diſpute not now, Whether he hath ſo revealed theſe things, but that it is impoſſible for any thing to be looked on as an *Article* of *Faith*, but what hath clear *Divine Revelation* for it. And therefore, although many teſtimonies of the *Fathers* might be produced one way or other, as to theſe things; when they ſpeak only their own fancies and imaginations, and not what *God* hath revealed, they cannot, all put together, make the opinion they aſſert to be an *Article* of *Faith*. Nothing is more apparent, than that the *itching curioſity* of humane nature to know more than *God* hath revealed, concerning the future ſtate of ſouls, did betimes diſcover it ſelf in the *Church*. But the ſtrange diverſity of theſe *Imaginations* were a ſufficient evidence, that they ſpake not by any *certain rule*, but according to their different *fancies*; and therefore that they did not deliver any Doctrine of *Faith*, but only their own private opinions. If you would therefore prove, that the *Fathers* did own *Purgatory* as an *Article* of *Faith*, you muſt not think it enough to prove, that one or two of the *Fathers* did ſpeak ſomething tending to it, but that all who had occaſion to mention it, did ſpeak of it as the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, and that which came from an immediate *Divine Revelation*.

2. *There is no reaſon, That ſhould be looked on as an Article of Faith, which, they who ſeemed to aſſert it moſt, did build on ſuch places, which they acknowledged themſelves to be very obſcure.* For ſince they deduced it from *Scripture*, it is apparent that they did not believe it on the account of any *unwritten word*, or *Divine Revelation* conveyed meerly by *Tradition*; and ſince they confeſs the places to be very *difficult*, it is unreaſonable to judge, that they looked on that as a matter of *Faith*, which they ſuppoſed was contained in them. As for inſtance, St. *Auſtin* in ſeveral places aſſerts, that all things neceſſary to be believed are clearly revealed in *Scripture*; and withal he ſayes, that the place 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. *is very difficult and obſcure*, and that it is one of thoſe places in St. *Paul*, which St. *Peter* ſaith are hard to be underſtood; and therefore it is not conceivable that St. *Auſtin* ſhould make any thing a *matter* of *Faith*, which he founds upon this place. And this is the great and almoſt only conſiderable Place, which he or the reſt of the *Fathers* did inſiſt on, as to the nature of that *purgation* which was to be in a future ſtate.

Aug. de fide & oper. c. 15, 16.

3. *That cannot be looked on as an Article of Faith to ſuch perſons, who expreſs their own doubts concerning the truth of it.* For whatever is owned as an *Article* of *Faith* by any perſon, is thereby acknowledged to be *firmly believed* by him. Now upon our enquiry into the *Fathers* we ſhall find, the firſt perſon who ſeemed to aſſert that any faithful *ſouls* paſſed through a *fire of purgation before the day of judgement*, was St. *Auſtin*: but he delivers his judgement with ſo much fear and heſitancy, that any one may eaſily ſee that he was far from making it an Article of Faith. We muſt conſider

ſider then, that in St. *Auguſtin*'s time, there were many, who though they denyed *Origen*'s opinion as to the *Salvation* at laſt of all *perſons*; yet were very willing to believe it, as to all thoſe who dyed in the *Communion* of the *Church*, that though they paſſed through the *flames* of *Hell* for their ſins, yet at laſt they ſhould be ſaved; and for this they mainly inſiſted on 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. where it is ſaid, *That ſome ſhould be ſaved, but as by fire. Such*, ſay they, *build upon the foundation gold, ſilver, pretious ſtones, who to their Faith add good works: but they, hay, wood, and ſtubble, whoſe life is contrary to their Faith; and yet theſe latter, they aſſerted ſhould come to Heaven at laſt, but they muſt undergo the torments of Hell firſt.* Againſt theſe St. *Auſtin* writes his book *de fide & operibus*, wherein he proves that ſuch *as live in ſin ſhall be finally excluded the Kingdom of Heaven*; And when he co nes to the interpretation of that place, he gives this account of it, That thoſe who do ſo love *Chriſt*, as rather to part with all things for him than to loſe him, but yet have too great a love to the things of the world, ſhall ſuffer grief and loſs on that account. *Sive ergo in hâc vitâ tantum homines iſta patiuntur, ſive etiam poſt hanc vitam talia quædam judicia ſubſequuntur; non abhorret, quantum arbitror, à ratione veritatis iſte intellectus hujus ſententiæ. Whether*, ſaith he, *men ſuffer theſe things in this life, or ſuch judgements follow after it; I ſuppoſe this ſenſe of S.* Paul's *meaning is not diſſonant from truth.* So far was he from being certain of it, that he puts in, *quantum arbitror*, as far as I ſuppoſe; and yet he would not define, whether that loſs which they were to ſuffer were only in *this life* or no. And in his *Enchiridion* to *Laurentius*, where he diſputes the very ſame matter, he ſaith, *Tale aliquid poſt hanc vitam fieri incredibile non eſt; & utrum ita ſit quæri poteſt, & aut inveniri aut latere, Nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium, quanto magis minuſve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiuſve ſalvari. It is not incredible that ſuch a thing ſhould be after this life, and it may be enquired after whether it be found to be ſo or no, that ſome faithful ſouls paſs through a purging fire, and are ſaved ſooner or later according to the degree of their affection to worldly things.* Will any man in his wits think that St. *Auſtin* ſpake this of any *matter of Faith*, or that was generally received in the *Church* as an *Apoſtolical Tradition?* Did he ever ſpeak ſo concerning the *Trinity* or the *Incarnation of Chriſt* which you parallel with *Purgatory?* What would men have thought of him, if he had ſaid of either of thoſe Articles, *It is not incredible they may be true*, and *it may be enquired into whether they be or no?* Whatever then St. *Auſtin*'s private opinion was, we ſee he delivers it modeſtly and doubtfully, not obtruding it as an *Article* of *Faith*, or *Apoſtolical Tradition if any be.* And the very ſame he repeats in his Anſwer to the firſt *Queſtion* of *Dulcitius*; ſo that this was all that ever he aſſerted as to this Controverſie. What you offer to the contrary from other places of St. *Auſtin* ſhall be conſidered in its due place.

Aug. de fide & oper. c. 16.

Enchirid. c. 69.

4. *Where any of the Fathers build any Doctrine upon the ſenſe of doubtful places of Scripture, we have no further reaſon to believe that Doctrine, than we have to believe that it is the meaning of thoſe places.* So that in this caſe the enquiry is taken off from the *judgement* of the *Fathers*, and fixed upon the ſenſe of the *Scriptures* which they and we both rely upon. For ſince they pretend themſelves to no greater evidence of the *truth* of the *Doctrine* than ſuch places do afford: it is the greateſt reaſon that the argument to perſwade us be not the teſtimony of the *Father*, but the evidence of the place it ſelf. Unleſs it be evident ſome other way, that there was an univerſal *Tradition* in the *Church* from the *Apoſtles* times concerning it, and that the only deſign of the *Father* was, to apply ſome particular place to it. But then ſuch a *Tradition* muſt be cleared from ſomething elſe, beſides the

the ſenſe of ſome ambiguous places of *Scripture*, and that *Tradition* manifeſted to be *Univerſal* both as to time and place.

§. 6. Theſe things being premiſed, I now come particularly to examine the evidence you bring, *That all the Fathers both Greek and Latin did conſtantly teach Purgatory from the Apoſtles times, and conſequently that it muſt be held for an Apoſtolical Tradition or nothing can be.* And as you follow *Bellarmin* in your way of proving it, ſo muſt I follow you; and he divides his proofs you ſay into two ranks. Firſt, *Such who affirm prayer for the dead.* 2. *Such who in the ſucceſſive ages of the Church did expreſly affirm Purgatory.* Firſt, With thoſe
P. 306. *who affirm prayer for the dead; Which* (you ſay) *doth neceſſarily infer Purgatory, whatever the Biſhop vainly inſinuates to the contrary.* The *Queſtion* then between us is, Whether that *prayer* for the *dead* which was uſed in the *ancient Church*, doth neceſſarily infer, that *Purgatory* was then acknowledged? This you affirm; for, ſay you, *If there were no other place, or condition of being for departed ſouls, but either Heaven or Hell, ſurely it were a vain thing to pray for the dead; eſpecially to pray for the remiſſion of their ſins, or for their refreſhment, eaſe, reſt, relaxation of their pains, as Ancients moſt frequently do. From whence,* you add, *that Purgatory is ſo undenyably proved, that the Relator finding nothing himſelf ſufficient to Anſwer, was forced to put us off to the late Primate of* Armagh's *Anſwer to the Jeſuits Challenge.* Which, you ſay, *You have peruſed, and find only there, that the Author proves that which none of you deny,* viz. *That the prayers and commemorations uſed for the dead had reference to more ſouls than thoſe in Purgatory. But,* you attempt to prove, *That the nature and kind of thoſe prayers do imply that they were intended for other ends, than meerly that the body might be glorified as well as the ſoul, and to praiſe God for the final happy end of the deceaſed: Whereas that Anſwerer of the Jeſuite would,* you ſay, *by his allegations inſinuate to the Reader a conceit, that it was uſed only for thoſe two reaſons and no other; Which,* you ſay, *you muſt needs avouch to be moſt loudly untrue, and ſo manifeſtly contrary to the Doctrine and practice of the Fathers, as nothing can be more.* A high charge againſt two moſt *Reverend* and *learned Primates* together: againſt the one, *as not being able to Anſwer, and therefore turning it off to the other*; againſt the other, *for publiſhing moſt loud untruths, inſtead of giving a true account of the grounds of the Churches practice.* It ſeems, you thought it not honour enough to overcome one, unleſs you led the other in triumph alſo; but you do neither of them, but only in your own fancy and imagination. And never had you leſs cauſe to give out ſuch big words than here, unleſs it were to amuſe the ſpectators, that they might not ſee how you fall before them. For it was not the leaſt diſtruſt of his ſufficiency to Anſwer, which made his Lordſhip to put it off to the *Primate* of *Armagh*, but becauſe he was prevented in it by him, *Who,* (as he truly ſaith) *had very learnedly and at large ſet down other reaſons which the Ancients gave for prayer for the dead without any intention to free them from Purgatory.* Which are not
Anſwer to the Jeſuits challenge, p. 195. only different from, but inconſiſtent with, the belief of *Purgatory*; for the clearing of which, and vindicating my *Lord Primate* from your calumnies rather than anſwers, it will be neceſſary to give a brief account of his Diſcourſe on that ſubject. He tells us therefore at firſt, That we are here prudently to diſtinguiſh the *Original inſtitution of the Church*, from the *private opinions* of *particular Doctors*, which waded further herein than the general intendment of the *Church* did give them warrant. Now he evidently proves that the *memorials*, *oblations*, and *prayers* made for the *dead* at the beginning had reference to ſuch as reſted from their *labours*, and not unto any ſouls which were thought to be tormented in that *Utopian Purgatory*, whereof there was no news ſtirring in thoſe dayes. This he gathers firſt by the practice of the ancient *Chriſtians* laid down by the

Author

Author of the *Commentaries* on *Job*, who ſaith, The memorials of the *Saints* were obſerved as a memorial of reſt to the ſouls departed, and that they therein rejoyced for their *refreſhing*. St. *Cyprian* ſaith, they offered Sacrifices for them, whom he acknowledgeth to have received of the Lord *Palms* and *Crowns*; and in the Author of the *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*, the party deceaſed is deſcribed by him to have departed this life *repleniſhed with Divine joy, as now not fearing any change to worſe, being come unto the end of all his labours, and publickly pronounced to be a happy man, and admitted into the ſociety of the Saints*; and yet the *Biſhop* prays, that *God would forgive him all his ſins he had committed through humane infirmity, and bring him into the light and band of the living, into the boſoms of* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob, *into the place fram whence pain, and ſorrow, and ſighing flyeth.* And St. *Chryſoſtom* ſhews that the funeral Ordinances of the *Church* were appointed to admoniſh the living, that the parties deceaſed were *in a ſtate of joy and not of grief*; and therefore they ſung at the *Burial, Return my ſoul to thy reſt, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee.* And this he proves likewiſe from the *Ancient Liturgies*, wherein prayers are made for all *Saints, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, Martyrs*, and others. And S. *Ambroſe*, after he had ſaid, *That* Valentinian *and* Gratian *were both bleſſed, and enjoyed the pleaſures of everlaſting life*; and yet ſubjoyns his *Orizons* for them. Thus he prays for *Theodoſius, of whom he had ſaid, That he enjoys everlaſting light, and continual tranquillity:* And ſo for his Brother *Satyrus*, when he had pronounced of him before, *That he had entred into the Kingdom of Heaven.* The ſame doth *Gregory Nazianzen* for his Brother *Caſarius.* Now, Is it poſſible that you ſhould think that Prayer for the *Dead*, as uſed in the Ancient *Church*, doth neceſſarily inferr *Purgatory*; when they who made theſe *Prayers*, did ſuppoſe the perſons they made them for, to be at *reſt*, and in *joy*, and in the *Kingdom of Heaven?* And I hope that is a different ſtate from that of *Purgatory.* Therefore you ſee, it is not barely proved, that ſome different accounts are given of *Prayer* for the *Dead*, but ſuch as are excluſive of it, and thoſe ſuch as appear from the eldeſt times of the *Church*, when ſuch Prayers were uſed. Now, having thus ſhewed, for whom theſe *Prayers* were made, he proceeds to ſhew, of what kinds they were, *whereof*, he ſaith, *ſome were Euchariſtical* for the bleſſed eſtate of the party deceaſed; others *deprecatory*, and *petitory*, that *God* would forgive him *his ſins*, keep him from *Hell*, and place him in the *Kingdom of Heaven:* which, though at firſt well meant, were turned to an ill uſe afterwards, when theſe *interceſſions* began once to be applied not only to the good, but evil livers alſo, unto whom by the firſt Inſtitution they were never intended. And he at large proves by very many examples, that the primary Intention of the *Church* in her ſupplications for the Dead, was, That the whole man (not the ſoul ſeparated only) might receive *publick remiſſion* of *ſins*, and a ſolemn acquittal in the judgement of that great Day, and ſo obtain both a full eſcape from all the conſequences of ſin, and a perfect conſummation of bliſs and happineſs. And of this nature he ſhews afterwards were the Prayers of the *Church* uſed in *Epiphanius* his time, which *Aerius* was condemned for rejecting of; and he plainly proves, that the *Church* of *Rome* comes nearer the Opinion of *Aerius*, than they would ſeem to do. For they agree with *Aerius*, in rejecting that kind of praying and offering for the Dead, which was uſed in the *Church* at that time; which was for ſuch as were believed to be in bliſs. For, ſince the *Romaniſts* ſay, That without the ſuppoſition of *Purgatory*, Prayer for the Dead would be unprofitable, and at that time the ſouls they prayed for, are ſuppoſed to be already in *bliſs*; therefore they do as much condemn thoſe Prayers for the *Dead*, which were then uſed, as *Aerius* did. And it is very ſtrange, if

P. 204.

P. 224.

P. 265.

the

the releasing of *souls* out of *Purgatory*, had been any ground then of *praying for the Dead*, that *Epiphanius*, among all his far-fetcht Reasons, should never assign that, which you think to be the only proper ground of such Prayers. Thus we see, what was the general Intention of the Church in those Prayers which were made for the Dead, and how far this was from inferring *Purgatory*.

§. 7. But besides this, there were several *particular Opinions* among the Ancient *Fathers* touching the *place* and *condition* of *souls separated* from their
P. 229. *bodies*: and according to the several apprehensions which they had thereof, they made different interpretations and applications of the *Use* of *praying* for the *Dead*; whose particular intentions and devotions in that kind, must of necessity therefore be distinguished from the general intention of the whole *Church*. Thus there were two Opinions much in *vogue* among many of the *Fathers*, *viz. of souls being kept in secret receptacles till the day of resurrection*, and the *purging of them in the fire of conflagration at the day of judgement*; of which Opinion were not only S. *Augustin*, but *Origen*, *Lactantius*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Ambrose*, and others. Now according to these Opinions they interpreted the *Use* of *praying* for the *Dead*. And
P. 207. thence S. *Augustin* saith, *That the oblations and alms usually offered in the Church for all the Dead that received Baptism, were thanksgivings for such as were very good, propitiations for such as were not very bad; but as for such as were very evil, although they were no helps of the Dead, yet were they some kind of consolations of the Living*; but this was only a private exposition of the *Churches* meaning in her Prayers, because it is not to be found in the writings of the former *Fathers*; and, because it suiteth not well with the general practice of the *Church*, which it intendeth to interpret. For it is somewhat too harsh an interpretation, to imagine that one and the same act of praying, should be a petition for some, and for others only a thanksgiving. Some other
P. 241. private Opinions there were besides these, as that of *Theophylact*, That *God did not always cast grievous sinners into Hell, but that the Prayers of the Church might keep them from being cast into Hell*; another, *That an augmentation of Glory might be procured for the Saints*, and either a total deliverance, or a diminution of torment at least, obtained for the wicked; to which S. *Chry-*
P. 243. *sostom* and others incline. Besides, there were different Opinions concerning the benefit which the Dead received, by the Prayers of the Living. For the Author of the Questions and Answers in *Justin Martyrs works*,
P. 270. *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Theodoret*, *Diodorus Tarsensis*, and S. *Hierom*, all conclude that there is no release to be expected for the sins of those who were dead. But others supposed, the *Dead* might receive profit by the *Prayers* of the *Living*, either for *remission* of their *sins*, or the *ceasing* of their *punishment*; but they were not agreed as to the nature of the *sins*, which might be pardoned, or the manner of the benefit which they received, whether their punishment were only lessened, or at last extinguished. And *Stephanus Gobarus* in *Photius*, tells us, That though some held these things, yet the true sentence of the *Church* was, *That none at all was freed from punish-*
P. 281. *ment*. But that still this was a Question in the *Church*, Whether the Dead received profit by the Prayers of the Living, that *learned Author* more at large proves; but my design is only to give a very brief extract of his discourse, that you may from thence see, how far, by the *Intention* of the *Church* in *praying for the Dead*, you are from gathering the necessary belief of *Purgatory*.

§. 8. And by this a full Answer is given to what you object *concerning the*
P. 561. *practice of the Fathers, to pray for the soul, and not the body; and that when we pray for them, they receive ease, comfort, and refreshment by our Prayers, and that they obtain pardon, and mercy, and deliverance from pain for them, and that by the help of our Prayers they are brought to eternal rest and happi-*
ness.

neſs. But all this falls ſhort of your purpoſe, unleſs you can prove th t any of them either believed or prayed that any ſuch *eaſe* and *refreſhment* were obtained by the *Prayers* of the *Living* before the *day* of *Reſurrection.* That they prayed, *That God would have mercy upon them in that day*, we deny not, which implies *eaſe, comfort, refreſhment, pardon, deliverance from pain*, and *eternal happineſs*; but then all this referrs not to any *purgatory-pains*, which they had undergone before, but thoſe *eternal pains* which their ſins deſerved, if *God* ſhould deal in juſtice with them. We grant then, that ſupplications and interceſſions were uſed in the *Church* for the *Dead*, but we ſay, They did reſpect by the intention of the *Church* the *day* of *judgement*, and *Gods* final *juſtification* of them by his ſentence at that day. For the Scriptures (as my *Lord Primate* truly ſaith) every where do point out that *great day* to us, as the *day* wherein *mercy and forgiveneſs, reſt and refreſhing, joy and gladneſs, redemption and ſalvation, rewards and Crowns*, ſhall be beſtowed upon all *Gods Children*, 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18. 1 Cor. 1. 8. Act. 3. 19. 2 Theſ. 1. 6, 7. Phil. 2. 19. 1 Theſ. 2. 16. 1 Pet. 1. 5. 1 Cor. 5. 5. Epheſ. 4. 30. Luk. 21. 28. 2 Tim. 4. 8. Luk. 14. 14. From whence it is no improbable deduction, that even the *ſouls* of good men, do not enjoy their full and compleat felicity, till the great day: not that they either ſleep or undergo any *Purgatory pains*; but that they are at reſt from their labours, and in a bleſſed condition, but ſtill waiting with a ſolicitous expectation for the glorious Coming of *Chriſt*, that they may then receive the reward prepared for them before the beginning of the world. But, Whether thoſe ſouls be in *Heaven* (as it notes a place, and not a ſtate) whether the *degrees* of their *happineſs* be proportionable (till the *great day*) to the *degrees* of *grace*, which they had when they left the world, are Queſtions of more curioſity, than neceſſity to be reſolved. But, as long as the *Scripture* doth inſiſt ſo much on the proceedings of the great *day*, both as to rewards and puniſhments, we do not condemn the practice of the *Ancient Church* in thoſe prayers which did thus reſpect the day of *Reſurrection*. If any of the *Fathers* had any particular Opinions concerning the *ſtate* of the *Dead*, and of the benefit which came to them by the Prayers of the Living; we are no more concerned to defend them, than you are to defend thoſe whom you acknowledge to hold, that no ſouls did enjoy the *beatifical viſion* before the day of judgement, againſt whom *Bellarmin* and others diſpute at large. Since you therefore confeſs your ſelves that ſome of the greateſt of the *Fathers* did for many ages hold erroneous Opinions concerning the *ſtate* of the *Dead*, With what reaſon can you preſs us with the Teſtimonies of thoſe whom you refuſe your ſelves? And ſince they had ſo many different Opinions concerning the ſtate of *ſouls*, it ſeems ſtrange that none of them (at leaſt till S. *Auguſtin*'s time) ſhould hit upon ſuch a ſtate of *Purgation*, whereby they might be freed from pains before the day of judgement. And yet we find not one of them, which did ſo much as dream of that *Purgatory* which you call *the upper Region of Hell*; or of any puniſhment, which they who dyed in favour with God, ſhould undergo between death and judgement, out of which they might be delivered by the Prayers of the Living. Many of them indeed ſuppoſed that *ſouls* were kept in *ſecret receptacles*; but they were far from aſſerting that they underwent at all any pains equal to the *damned*, much leſs that any ſouls were tranſlated thence to glory upon the *interceſſions* made for them; others ſuppoſed that the *ſouls* of all good men were at laſt to paſs thorow the *fire* of *conflagration* at the *day* of *judgement*; others, that the ſouls of wicked men might either eſcape, or have their torments mitigated; but all this while your *Purgatory* was unthought of, and was not conceived till afterwards, through the *ignorance* and *ſuperſtition* of ſome, countenanced by pretended *apparitions* and

Anſw. p. 217.

viſions of ſouls departed till at laſt it grew to be one of the favourite Opinions of the *Roman Church*. From whence it may eaſily appear, how very much you were deceived, when you would inferr, becauſe *Prayer* for the *Dead*, as it is now uſed in the *Roman Church*, doth neceſſarily ſuppoſe *Purgatory*; therefore it muſt do ſo in the *Ancient Church*: for, although we ſhould grant the ſame *Prayers* to be ſtill uſed, yet ſince they are uſed for a quite different intent, that may be ſuppoſed by you, which was not at all ſuppoſed by them, nor could be inferred from what they did. And yet it is plain, that in ſome caſes, you have changed the *Prayers* for the *Saints*, into *Prayers* to them: For, whereas in the old *Gregorian Sacramentary*, it was, *Grant unto us O Lord, that this oblation may profit the ſoul of thy ſervant* Leo; in the latter Books it is turned into this, *Grant unto us O Lord, that by the interceſſion of thy ſervant* Leo, *this oblation may profit us*. From whence you may ſee, that your Prayers are changed from what they were: For the *Ancient Church* prayed univerſally for all *Saints and Martyrs*; but you think it a diſparagement to them to *pray* for them; and therefore from your kind of Prayers for the Dead, we may well ſay, that *Purgatory* is ſuppoſed; but we cannot poſſibly inferr it from thoſe *Prayers* which were made for ſuch, who, if any, were ſuppoſed in a ſtate of Bliſs and happineſs.

Anſwer to the Jeſuit, p. 210.

§. 9. And that the intention of your *Church* is quite different from the *Ancient*, we now come more fully to make manifeſt; becauſe none of them did believe that Doctrine of *Purgatory*, which you aſſert. But herein we muſt follow your footſteps, and conſider the many authorities which you produce out of *Bellarmin*, and undertake to vindicate in behalf of *Purgatory*; to which I give this general Anſwer, That ſome Authors are counterfeit, and the places ſuppoſititious; of thoſe that are *true*, ſome ſpeak only of *Commemoration* of the *Dead*, and *Oblations* made for them; others reſpect the day of *Reſurrection*, and the *fire* of *Conflagration*, others the *purging* of the *wicked*, others only of a *purgation* in this life; but none of them all ſpeak of any *Purgatory pains* of thoſe who dye in favour with *God*, which they undergo as the *temporal puniſhment of ſin, from whence they may be delivered by the Prayers of the Living*; which is the only thing you ſhould prove from them. And this I come to make appear by the examination of the particulars, as they occurr in order.

P. 361. The firſt you begin with, is, *Dionyſius Areopagita*; and, *Is not he*, ſay you, *an Author of the firſt three hundred years?* As though this had never been queſtioned by any? If you had asked, Whether he had been an Ancient and Learned Author, living ſometime within the firſt four hundred years; you ſhould not have met with any oppoſition from me. But if you will needs have him to be the true *Dionyſius*, you muſt prove it better than by meer referring us to what *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, and *Del-Rio* have ſaid upon that ſubject; and you are very ſtrangely deceived when you ſay, *That only* Eraſmus, *and* Valla, *and ſome few others, did doubt of it; but at preſent you ſuppoſe few learned men doubt of the matter.* For, even *Bellarmin* himſelf doubts of it; and, What think you of *Hubertus*, *Sirmondus*, *Launœus*, *Petavius*? Are not all theſe with you learned men, who have all declared their doubts of it? and ſo will any one elſe do, that impartially examines the Arguments brought on both ſides. But we have no reaſon to inſiſt longer upon this, ſince you ſay, *It is ſufficient that he is acknowledged for a Writer of great Antiquity*; Well, But what is it then this Author ſaith? only that *Prayers were made for the deceaſed party, that God would forgive his ſins, and place him in the Light and Country of the Living*: *But*, ſay you, *both the Arch Biſhop and Primate would have thought that man a Papiſt, who would have made the like prayer for his deceaſed friend in their hearing.* And very good reaſon they might have to think ſo, when they know

De Conſum. l. 2. c. 7.

know beforehand that your intention of praying for the *Dead*, is, to deliver their ſouls from the pains of purgatory; but, if they had heard one uſe ſuch a Prayer in the *Ancient Church*, they could not have imagined, it was for any ſuch intention, ſince the ſame perſon in *Dionyſius* is ſaid to be *repleniſhed with divine joy, and not fearing any change to the worſe, but knowing well that the good things poſſeſſed, ſhall be firmly and everlaſtingly enjoyed*; as he ſpeaks at his entrance upon that diſcourſe: And, *if this be in effect to teach Purgatory*, as you would have it, you muſt ſet your *Purgatory* a great deal higher than you do; for, you ſay, It is but an *upper Region of Hell*, a little after, when *Dionyſius* ſpeaks of thoſe who were in a Region of reſt and happineſs. *Dionyſ. Areop. de Eccles. Hier. cap. 7.*

Your ſecond Author is *Tertullian*; and three Citations you produce out of him. In the firſt, he only mentions the *oblations for the Dead*, which we have confeſſed to be uſed already, but without any reſpect to *Purgatory*. In the ſecond, a mention is made of begging of God *refrigerium, refreſhment for the ſoul of one departed*: this were ſome thing to the purpoſe, if you had firſt proved, that *Tertullian* did ſuppoſe that ſoul to be then in the pains of *Purgatory*; for then it were but reaſon to think this *refrigerium* did relate to the eaſing of them. But he elſewhere tells us, what he means by this *refrigerium, Sinus Abrahæ interim refrigerium præbiturus eſt animabus juſtorum*, by which he underſtands not any *deliverance* from *pains*, but contentment in expectation of the future *Reſurrection*. It was the ardency of the deſire after that which made them pray for this *refrigerium*, not out of any *puniſhment* they were ſuppoſed to be under for ſin, but their earneſt expectation of future glory. And, ſince they ſuppoſed different degrees of *refreſhment* which the ſouls had in the *boſom* of *Abraham*, this prayer only notes the deſire of the continuance and increaſe of it, and not being under preſent pains for the want of it. *De Coron. Mili. c. 3. De Monog. c. 10. c. Marc. l. 4. c. 34.*

In the laſt place of *Tertullian*, you would fain have the *Carcer infernus* to be *Purgatory*, but he means no more by it than *Hades*, or the common receptacle of *ſouls* till the *day* of *Reſurrection*, which *Irenæus* calls *locum inviſibilem*, which renders ἀΐδης exactly, in which he makes ſouls to ſtay till the *day* of *Reſurrection*; and *Tertullian* explains himſelf afterwards, when he ſayes, *Conſtituimus omnem animam apud Inferos ſequeſtrari in diem Domini*; and therefore *Bellarmin* confeſſes *Tertullian* to be one of thoſe, that held that no *ſouls* did enjoy the *beatifical viſion*, till the *day* of *Reſurrection*; at which time he ſuppoſed the order of riſing, to be according to the degrees of holineſs; and therefore he makes the puniſhment of ſouls not to be any *Purgatory pains*, but the *mora reſurrectionis*, that they ſhould be longer before they riſe from the dead, *viz.* towards the latter end of the thouſand years; for ſo he makes the *Reſurrection* to continue the thouſand *years* of *Chriſt's Reign* upon earth; and, as the higheſt rank of *Chriſtians* ſhould riſe in the beginning of it, ſo others in their order according to their *degrees*, and the moſt ſlothful and negligent to be puniſhed *morâ reſurrectionis*, by their Reſurrection being deferred to the concluſion of it. By which we fully underſtand *Tertullian*'s meaning, *Judex in carcerem te mandet infernum, unde non dimittaris, niſi modico quòque delicto morâ reſurrectionis expenſo*; by which *lower priſon* he intends neither *Hell* nor *Purgatory*, but the common *receptacle* of ſouls, wherein they were held till they ſhould riſe ſooner or later according to the meaſure of their graces and ſins. *De anim. c. 34. Iren. l. 5. cap. 25. De An. cap. 55.*

The next place to be examined, is the noted one of St. *Cyprian*, to *Antonianus*: where he gives an account of the difference between the lapſed perſons who become penitents, and the Martyrs. *Aliud eſt ad veniam ſtare, aliud ad gloriam pervenire; aliud miſſum in carcerem non exire inde, donec* §. 10.

solvat novissimum quadrantem; aliud statim fidei & virtutis mercedem accipere; aliud pro peccatis longo dolorere emendari, & purgari diu igne, aliud peccata omnia passione purgâsse. It is one thing to stay in hope and expectation of pardon, another thing to come presently to glory; 'tis one thing to be cast into prison, and not to come out thence, till you have paid the last farthing; another to receive presently the reward of our Faith: 'tis one thing to be amended for sins by long grief, and to be purged with fire a great while; another to have purged away all his sins by suffering Martyrdom. Did not S. Cyprian, say you, *think of Purgatory, when he taught this?* No, that did he not, if we believe your own Writers. For *Rigaltius* tells us, that S. *Cyprian* here speaks of the severities of *penance*, which the lapsed persons underwent in order to *pardon*; and compares them with the present *felicity* which *Martyrs* were possessed of. And this was that purging *fire* in order to their amendment, which he insists on, to shew what great disparity there was between the state of these *penitents*, and the *Martyrs*; thereby to shew, that though penitents were admitted by the *Church*, yet it was with so much severity, that might give little encouragement for men to fall in hopes of admission. For that was the main thing which S. *Cyprian* there discourses of. And thus likewise *Albaspinaus* understands it, of such who suffered pennance all their life time, and were absolved only at the point of death; these were they who were *held in prison till they paid the utmost farthing.* Neither may it seem strange that this should be called a *purging fire*; since S. *Hierom* describing the penance of *Fabiola*, saith, *Sedit super carbones ignis, She sate upon coals of fire*; and *Pope Siricius* in his Epistle to *Himmerius* extant in the *Councils*, calls, *perpetual penance, purificatorium pœnitudinis ignem*, the purging fire of penance. And this seems a great deal more probable to be S. *Cyprian*'s meaning, because he speaks most clearly of any of the *Fathers* of the immediate happiness of all *Gods Children* after death, in his excellent Book of *mortality*; wherein he comforts the *Christians* of *Carthage* against the fears of death, by reason of the raging plague, which was then among them. *It is for him*, saith he, *to fear death, that would not go to Christ; it is for him not to be willing to go to Christ, that doth not believe he shall begin to raign with him*; with much more to the same purpose throughout that Book, which, I pray read, and then tell me, Whether St. *Cyprian* did think of *Purgatory* or no.

Rigalt. observ. ad Cypr. 68.

Albaspin. observ. l. 2. *c.* 12.

Hieron. ep. Fab. ad Octan.

§. 11. I wonder with what face you produce *Origen*'s Testimony in behalf of your Doctrine of *Purgatory*, since *Bellarmin* confesses that he held all *punishment* to be only *Purgatory*; and that this Opinion of his was condemned in the fifth *Oecumenical Council*. *But*, you say, *in the place produced by you, he saith no such thing, but that men are purged according to the mixture of Lead and Gold in them, but that those who have all Lead, shall sink down to the bottomless pit for ever. Than which* (you say) *nothing can be spoken more clearly for Purgatory.* To which a short Answer shall serve by this *Dilemma*; either you have faithfully represented this place of *Origen*, or not: If you have, it is plain that *Origen* hath been infinitely abused, or else apparently contradicts himself; for you make him here plainly to assert the *eternity* of *punishment*, which the *fifth General Council* according to you *infallibly* condemned him for denying; if you have unfaithfully represented him, then still *Origen* cannot be understood of such a *Purgatory* as you speak of, but of such a one which all must pass thorow, good and bad; and their continuance in it, is according to the proportions of good or evil in them. And of such a *Purgatory* as this, *Bellarmin* confesses that *Origen* speaks: and which he places after the *Resurrection*, and saith, That *even* Peter *and* Paul *must pass thorow it.* And for such *Purgatory* as this is, many places are produced out of *Origen*, by *Sixtus Senensis*, and many others. But this

P. 363.

De Purgat. l. 2. *c.* 1.

Bibl. oth. l. 5. *Annot.* 170.

this is an univerſal *Purgatory* for *good* and *bad*, after the *Reſurrection*, and for the *body* as well as the *ſoul*; and judge you now, Whether this be the *Purgatory* you contend for or no. The following teſtimonies of St. *Ambroſe*, *Hilary*, *Lactantius*, S. *Hierom*, &c. are taken off by *Bellarmine* himſelf; ſince, although in his firſt Book he produceth them for the *Roman Doctrine* of *Purgatory*, yet in the beginning of the ſecond he confeſſeth, that all theſe were for ſuch an *Univerſal Purgatory* at the day of judgement, thorow which all muſt paſs, not the *Virgin Mary* her ſelf excepted. And St. *Hierom*, though he denies *Origen*'s *Hypotheſis* as to the *final Salvation* of all, yet ſeems by the places you cite out of him, very willing to admit of it, as to all ſuch who dye in the *Churches Communion*; againſt which Opinion St. *Auguſtin* at large diſputes, as I have ſhewed already. I acknowledge then that theſe Authours do ſpeak of a *purging fire*, but ſuch a one as your ſelves diſown and diſpute againſt, and *Bellarmine* could no other wayes bring any of them off, but by ſaying, That they ſpeak of the fire of the laſt judgement; by which we ſee the apparent *Sophiſtry*, in bringing thoſe as plain places for your *Purgatory*, which you confeſs your ſelves, are underſtood of ſomething elſe. It being confeſſed that they ſpeak of *purging*, conſequent to the *Reſurrection*, which is quite another thing from what you plead for. And beſides, it is plain from St. *Hierom*'s words, that he ſpeaks of *wicked men dying in the Communion of the Church, that they ſhall at laſt be ſaved.* And if you will needs have *arbitramur*, when it is oppoſed to *credimus*, to ſignifie a firm belief, (which is another proof of your skill in *Lexicons*) that which you can only inferr thence, is, that S. *Hierom* did, as firmly believe that *wicked men* (if Chriſtians) ſhould at laſt be ſaved, as that *Devils*, and *Atheiſts*, and other wicked men ſhould be finally damned. For theſe are his words; *Et ſicut Diaboli & omnium negatorum, atque impiorum qui dixerunt in corde ſuo, non eſt Deus, credimus æterna tormenta; ſic peccatorum atq; impiorum, & tamen Chriſtianorum, quorum opera in igne probanda ſunt atq; purganda, moderatam arbitramur, & mixtam clementiæ ſententiam Judicis.* And the ſame he rather more fully aſſerts in the other place, *& Chriſtianos, ſi in peccato præventi fuerint, ſalvandos eſſe poſt pœnas*; but you who are never backward in helping the *Fathers* to ſpeak out, very commodiouſly render it, *Such as dye before full and perfect Penance for the ſins, of which they had truly repented*: Which is as far from *Purgatory* as from St. *Hieroms* meaning, for he doth not oppoſe *penitent ſinners* to *impenitent*, but oppoſes *wicked men dying in the Churches Communion*, to the *Devil* and his *Angels*, and all other wicked perſons, *All which* (he ſaith) *ſhall periſh eternally, but ſuch as are Chriſtians ſhould be ſaved at laſt after undergoing puniſhment.* And it is to be obſerved, that at the end of the *Commentaries* on *Iſaiah*, he immediately before ſpeaks of that which is ſuppoſed to be the *Origenical Hypotheſis*, viz. *That the torments of the other life ſhall after a long time be ended*; and when he hath produced the places of *Scripture* which the favourers of it did produce, he only paſſes this cenſure of it, *Quod nos Dei ſolius ſcientiæ debemus derelinquere*; *Which we ought to leave to the knowledge of God alone*; and then concludes with that moderation of his ſentence, That he did believe the *eternity* of torments of *Devils*, *Atheiſts*, &c. but of ſuch who were *Chriſtians he did ſuppoſe God would mingle Mercy with his Juſtice, and that after they had been ſufficiently purged by fire they might eſcape at laſt.* If he had intended only a mitigation of their *torments* who were *Chriſtians*, the oppoſition could not lye as it doth, between the *eternity* of ſome, and the *clemency* of *God* in others, but the *eternity* muſt have been confeſſed in both, and the oppoſition made only in the *weight* of the *torments* of ſuch who were not *Chriſtians* above ſuch

Sixtus Sin. Bibliotb. l. 5. Annot. 171.

Comment. in Iſa. 66. ad fin.

Con. Pelag. l. 1.

as were. If St. *Hierome* doth (as *Bellarmine* contends) elſewhere contradict this, by ſo much the leſs is his teſtimony of any validity in this caſe, it being plain what his meaning is here; but that ſeems the leſs probable, becauſe he writ his *Books* againſt the *Pelagians* in which he aſſerts the ſame, not long before his death. This *purging fire* then, of St. *Hierome* makes little for your purpoſe, ſince it is only a more refined branch of *Origen*'s *Hypotheſis*, and is underſtood of a *fire* after the *Reſurrection*, and that of Hell, and not of *Purgatory*, and wherein wicked men ſhall be purged if they dyed in the *Churches Communion*, and not ſuch who repented of their ſins in this life. But if St. *Hierom* himſelf do not ſpeak to the purpoſe, you hope one under his name may do it (and we muſt needs ſay *Purgatory* hath been alwayes beholding to *forgeries*) for you cite his *Commentaries on the Proverbs*, which are rejected as counterfeit by *Sixtus Senenſis*, *Canus*, *Marianus Victorius*, and *Bellarmin* himſelf.

§. 12. P. 365. But from St. *Hierome* we proceed to St. *Baſil*, *who*, you ſay, *teaches the ſame Doctrine with him*; if he doth, it is very little for your comfort. But ſo far was St. *Baſil* from aſſerting your Doctrine, that although he ſpeaks of a *purging fire*, he ſpeaks not at all concerning it in another *life*, but only of that which purgeth out *ſins* in the *ſouls* of men in this life. For he calls the *Spirit of God* working upon mens ſouls, that πῦρ καθαρτικὸν, which *conſumes ſin* within them; as may be ſeen be comparing his Commentaries on the ſixth and the ninth of *Iſaiah* together. And where he afterwards ſpeaks not of an utter *rejection*, but an *expurgation* as by *fire*; it is plain that he underſtands it of the *fire* of *affliction* in this life, and not the *fire* of *Purgatory* in another. But whereever you meet with *fire* and *purging*, you think it impoſſible to be underſtood of any thing but your *Purgatory*; it ſeems you are hugely poſſeſſed with the fears of it, that you think you meet with it, whereever you go. But if you will needs have St. *Baſil* to ſpeak of a future ſtate, than your own *Sixtus Senenſis*, and *Eſtius* will tell you that he is to be underſtood of the *fire* of *Conflagration* at the *Day* of *Judgement*; of which he ſpeaks in ſeveral other places. And ſo *Nicetas* underſtands the place of *Gregory Nazianzen* which you produce about *Baptiſme by fire*, for ſaith he, *Per ignis baptiſmum, examen cenſuramque divini judicii intelligit*, and for that cites the place of the *Apoſtle*, *Every mans work ſhall be tryed by fire*. This he calls elſewhere *the laſt fire* by which our works ſhall be judged and purged. And of this *Lactantius* and *Hilary*, are to be underſtood: for *Hilary* expreſly ſaith, *That even the Virgin* Mary *ſhall paſs through it*, whom I hope you will not place in *Purgatory*. The teſtimony of *Boetius* ſhall then be taken, when you prove that he doth not ſpeak in the perſon of a *Philoſopher*, but of a *Chriſtian*, delivering matters of Faith with an *ut puto*; but if you had conſidered the deſign of his Book, for the ſake of *Philoſophy*, you might have ſpared his citation. And ſo you might for your own ſake that of *Theodoret*, which not only the *Greeks* in their *Apology* cry out on as counterfeit; but no ſuch place, as yet appears in any edition of *Theodoret*. And the ſame *Greeks* tell you, if you conſulted the honour of *Gregory Nyſſen* you would ſpare him too, becauſe he was a favourer of the *Origenical Hypotheſis* concerning the *redintegration* of all things; and ſo many places are produced out of him wherein he makes the nature of all pains to be Purgatory, that the *Patriarch Germanus* (of whom *Photius* ſpeaks) had no other way to vindicate him, but by ſaying that the *Origeniſts* had foiſted many places into his works. If you will therefore ſay, *That it is a groundleſs calumny, to ſay that any of the Fathers did corrupt the Chriſtian Doctrine by the opinions of* Plato; you muſt either deny that *Origen* and his followers ever aſſerted any Doctrine contrary to *Chriſtianity*, and therein contradict the fifth *Oecumenical Council*; or that any of the *Fathers* had any touch of *Ori-*

Comment. in Iſa. 9.

Sixtus Sen. l. 5. *Annot.* 171 *Eſtius in* 1 *Cor.* 3. *Nazian. orat.* 39.

Orat. 26. *In Pſal.* 118.

P. 367.

Biblioth. cod. 233.

Origen's

gen's opinion: both which I suppose are tasks you will be unwilling to undertake. But whether their opinions are true or false (which we are not now enquiring after) to be sure they are far enough from your Doctrine of *Purgatory*, which supposeth the Sin pardoned in this life, and yet the *punishment* undergone for it in another: which Doctrine if it were granted at all reasonable, it would be much more, asserting it to be after the *Resurrection*, when the body might endure pains as well as the soul, than so absurdly as you make the *soul* only to suffer, and that too in a way the most unlike of all other, *viz.* by a *material fire*.

But it is time we come to the succour of St. *Austin*, who it seems hath his share of *Purgatory* in this life; for, you say, *He hath the ill hap to be us'd the worst of all other*. Because his Lordship represents him as *dubious and uncertain* (as no doubt he was) in this point: which argues indeed that he was a *Novice* in your *Roman Faith*, but thereby the more a *Father* of the *Church*. But you are the man, that, let S. *Augustin* say what he will himself, will prove to his face, that he could not possibly be thought to deny or doubt of *Purgatory*. And it is a Combat worth seeing, to see you dispute against St. *Augustin*; but you do it so pitifully, that St. *Austin* remains as uncertain as ever he was. The only place which seems to the purpose, *Constat animus purgari post hinc vitam*, &c. is so notorious a counterfeit, that not only *Vives* confesses, no such words appeared in the ancient Copies; but they are wholly left out, not only in the *Basil Edition*, 1556. but in that of *Lyons* 1560. and in the latter *Louain* and *Paris* editions. The other places, you confess your self, relate to the benefit which the dead receive by the prayers of the living, of which a large account hath been already given without any supposition of *Purgatory*. Whether St. *Austins* doubts did referr only to the circumstances of *Purgatory*, and not to the thing it self, I leave it to the consideration of any reasonable man, who will read the places already cited, wherein those doubts are expressed. By which one may see at what rate you use your expressions, when you can have the face to say, *That S.* Austin *no less constantly teaches the Doctrine of Purgatory, than he doth the Doctrine of Heaven and Hell.* Which after the language of the *Sorbon* Censures, is a *false*, *rash*, and *scandalous assertion*, and as ungrounded as *Purgatory* it self. The remaining testimonies of St. *Cyril* and St. *Chrysostom*, only speak of *prayer* for the *dead*, and the benefit of that, and so offers nothing new to our consideration. But at last we are come to a man who did in good earnest believe *Purgatory*, and was the first of any name in the *Church* who did so, and that is *Gregory* 1. But whosoever reads in his *Dialogues* the excellent arguments he builds it on, and confirms it with, will find as much reason to pity his *superstition* and *credulity*, as to condemn his *Doctrine*. And *after this time*, his Lordship saith truly, *Purgatory was found too warm a business to be suffer'd to cool again; and in the after-ages more were frighted, than led by proof into the belief of it.* And although amidst the variety of judgements among the *Fathers* concerning the state of the dead, not one of them affirmed your Doctrine of *Purgatory*, before *Gregory* 1; yet by all means you will needs have it to have been still owned as an *Apostolical Tradition*, and an *Article of Faith*. But I commend you, that knowing the weakness of the arguments brought from the *Fathers* and *Scripture*, you at last take *Sanctuary* in the *Churches definition*; on the account of which you say, *We are as much bound to believe it as any other Article of Faith, yea as the Trinity or Incarnation it self.* But this holds for none, but only those who so little understand the grounds of their *Religion* as to believe it on the account of your *Churches Infallibility*; which is so far from being any ground of *Faith*, that if we had nothing more certain than that, to esta-

S. 13. P. 358.

P. 372.

blish

bliſh our *Faith* upon, you would be ſo far from making men believe *Purgatory* on that account, that you would ſooner make them queſtion, whether there were either *Heaven* or *Hell*. But though your *Church* be ſo far from *Infallibility* that we have found her guilty of many Errours, yet the *Word of God abideth for ever*, which alone is the ſure Foundation for our *Faith* to reſt upon. And ſo I conclude with your own *Prayer: I beſeech God to give all men light to ſee this Truth, and Grace to aſſent unto it; to the end, that by living in the militant Church in the Unity of Faith, we may come at laſt to meet in Glory in the triumphant Church of Heaven, which we may hope for by the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: To whom with the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt, be all honour and glory world without end.*

FINIS.